RATIONAL COMMUNISM.

THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE REPUBLIC OF NORTH AMERICA.

By A CAPITALIST.

New York:
THE TRUTH SEEKER COMPANY,
33 Clinton Place.
1885.

Copyrighted, 1885.

UTOPIA
RBR
V243R

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

Utopian Theories—My Early Teachings—A Lesson Soon Learned—Communism, Humanity—Why I Write—Inequality—A Striking Contrast..... 7–16

CHAPTER II.

THE VISION.

New York Transformed—Public Buildings—Dwellings—Streets and Asylums—Churches and their Concomitants—Schools of Spoliation—Our Standard of Morals—Transformation—Happiness and Content..... 21–35

CHAPTER III.

THE VISION.—CONTINUED.

Community-tracts—New York again—Rail and Highway Systems—Changes in the Surface of the Whole Continent.—Abolition of Cities..... 36–48

CHAPTER IV.

PRESENT EXTERNAL APPEARANCE OF OUR REPUBLIC.

Spencer and His Teachings—United Effort Indispensable—Functions of a Commercial City—The Contrast—Central Park—An Important Question—Free Trade a Concomitant of Communism—Courts and Lawyers to be Abolished—A General Clearance—Present Aspect of Long Island—Order Disregarded—Country Villages—Necessity of Organization—Schoolboy Farming—The Shakers—Oneida—The Benefit of Communal Life—Mississippi Valley as it is—Land Monopoly..... 49–81

CHAPTER V.

GOVERNMENT AND LAWS.

Election of Officers — Punishment for Offenses — Moral Suasion — A Model Community — A Few Words from Jefferson — Our Alleged "Universal Suffrage" System — Origin of Slavery — Our Legislative Machinery — The Political Bell-wether; His Henchmen and their Methods — The Part the Voters Play — Political Rascality; Extracts from the "Evening Post" and Henry George — Our Partisan Press — Our Jury System — Administration of Law — The Legislative Mill — Foreign Land Owners — The Great Instigator of Evil, Private Property 82–136

CHAPTER VI.

FINANCE.

The System of Finance Adopted in the New Republic — The Great Republics of the Globe — Mutual Help — A Change in our Financial System Necessary — Relative Value of Metals — Fictitious Value of Gold — Argument of the Hard-Money Advocate — A Story of King Gold — The God before All Others — Mill on the Money Question — A Proposed Exchange Note — Evils of a Shifting Currency — The Bank-note Fraud — Substitute for Gold — What to Do with Foreign Coin — Credit an Evil 137–168

CHAPTER VII.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS.

Proper Functions of a State — Mr. Spencer's Definition — Individual Effort: Its Result — What Mr. Spencer's Proposition Involves — Railroad Adventures — How Stock is Manipulated — Competing Lines and Excessive Rates — Mr. Mill's Method of Restricting Charges — Corruption Under Corporate Management — An Evil without a Remedy — Why the Republican Party Lost Power in 1884 — Functions Improperly Assumed by the State — Morals and Religion — Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic — Free Trade and Protection — Chinese Restriction — Interest — Usury — How Did Vanderbilt Get His Fortune? — The Money-Getting Talent — My Position on the Subject of Property Defined 169–200

PAGINATION INCORRECT

CHAPTER VIII.

PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION.

Distribution in the New Republic—Fixing Prices—Disadvantages of Competition—Our Hit-or-Miss Production—Isolated Farming—An Excess of Manufacturing Facilities—The Argument for Competition—Effect of Overproduction on Prices—Waste in Manufacture and Distribution—How Competition Enhances Cost—Effect of Competition on Character—Human Selfishness Encouraged—Charity—Why Men Succeed or Fail—Real Heroes—Bankruptcy—Extract from Louis Blanc 201–236

CHAPTER IX.

EDUCATION.

Theologians and the Theologic Age—The First Object of Education—The Art of Expression—A Universal Language—The Time for Teaching to Begin—Composition—Defects of Our Schools and Universities—Inefficient Text-books—Evils of Over-study—Physiology and Hygiene—The History of Man—Unjust Discrimination in Our Schools—Libraries in the New Republic—Higher Universities—Compulsory Education a Duty—Mistaken Callings—Possibilities of Human Achievement..... 237–272

CHAPTER X.

MORALITY AND RELIGION.

Spencer on the Growth of the Moral Sentiment—Christ as a Moralist—Obstacles to Morality—Effect of Theology on Morals—Bible Support of Wrongs—Skepticism as a Moral Influence—Private Property in the Way of Morality—What the Work-People Know—Deceit—How Great Fortunes are Acquired—All Men Should Earn Their Living—The Root of All Evil—What Jesus Thought of Private Property—Charity—The Ruling Passion—Moral Standard of the New Republic—God and Religion..... 273–305

CHAPTER XI.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

Diverse Views on the Question—The Hand of the Church Again—Empty Pledges—Law and Marriage—Attempts to Coerce Affection—Mill's Two Great Questions—The Children Question—Moral Ciphers—The Unhappily Married Should Be Given a Second Chance,

or Even a Third—Dishonoring the Marriage Relation—A Word from Milton—Liberal Divorce Laws—A Proper Marriage Contract—Necessity of Checking Population—How to Make Mankind Better—Our Fallen Sisterhood—How to Reclaim Them—Unjust Public Sentiment..... 306–337

CHAPTER XII.

LIFE IN THE NEW REPUBLIC.

Routine of the Day—Work, Play, and Entertainment—Transaction of Business—Agriculture and Mechanics—Dress—Hours of Leisure—Bureau of Statistics—Invention and Art—Debating Clubs—Conversations—Free Speech—Amusements and Recreations—The Museum—Indoor and Outdoor Games—Facilities for Traveling—Communism in the Country—Piscatorial Sports—Honor: How Attained—Crime Abolished—Under the One True Sovereign—An Old Acquaintance Recalled—Close of the Vision..... 338–366

CHAPTER XIII.

LIFE IN THE EXISTING REPUBLIC.

Caste—How We Live—Caste No. 1—Extravagance as Related to Trade—The Situation of the Rich Reviewed—Wealth without Happiness The Millionaire in Politics—Influence of Wealth on the Poor—Youths Ruined by Money The Criterion of Generosity—Caste No. 2—Extravagance to Preserve Appearances—The Middle-Class in the Country—Farm Life: Its Hardships—Caste No. 3—The Theological Idea—Our Responsibility—Patriotism—Brutalizing Effect of the Private Property System 367–418

CHAPTER XIV.

EXAMINATION OF THE OBJECTIONS TO COMMUNISM.

Mill on Socialism—Inequalities of Labor—Change of Employment—Suppression of Individuality—Importance of Free Thought—Influence of Public Opinion—Communism not Inimical to Freedom—Mr. Spencer on Communism—The Right of Property—A Quotation from Locke—Mr. Spencer's Verdict—Survival of the Fittest—An Erroneous View of Evolution..... 419–460

CHAPTER XV.

METHODS PROPOSED FOR THE TRANSITION FROM THE SYSTEM OF INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY TO A SYSTEM OF COLLECTIVE PROPERTY.

Violence Deprecated—Henry George's Methods Examined—Trades Unions and Co-operation The Yellow Springs Community: Why it Failed—Haverstraw, Coxsackie, Kendal, Oneida, New Harmony, Brook Farm, and Other Communities—Messrs. Frothingham, Dana, Greeley, and Others Quoted—Plan for a Pioneer Community—Property, Land, Members, and Officers—Difficulties—Dress—Let the Work be Begun 461–493

CHAPTER XVI.

DANGER.

The Great Cause of Contention—Premonitions of a Revolt—Something to be Done—Living in the Future..... 494–498

THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE REPUBLIC OF NORTH AMERICA.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

As THE wonderful things which I propose to relate in this work were presented to me in the form of a vision, I shall first endeavor to set the reader right concerning any predilection which I may have had in favor of dreams or visions. And I will make this explanation short by simply stating that I have heretofore held all such experiences as of little consequence; rarely having considered them of sufficient importance to be worth relating, or listening to when related by others; regarding them, in fact as but the hallucinations which naturally arise from an overburdened stomach or an overworked or diseased brain.

I would also inform the reader, at the outset, that what I am about to relate is intimately connected with, and decidedly in the interest of, that most unpopular and detested of all theories at the present day, namely, Communism, or the system of collective property. Those so bigoted that they do not wish to read or hear anything adverse to our existing property system will, of course, throw the book aside

here, thus saving the waste of their time and the ruffling of their tempers; but those who are less prejudiced, who hesitate, perhaps, but are still inclined to read, hear, and weigh both sides of this question, I would remind of the fact that heretofore many theories have arisen against which there has been at first quite as bitter an opposition as now prevails against Communism, and which have finally been demonstrated to be *true*.

Since the time of Sir Thomas More, theories in advance of the current ideas of the day have been contemptuously styled Utopian; but history clearly shows that all the great changes which have thus far taken place in the world, resulting in human progress, have been foreshadowed and set in motion by what were at first termed utopian or ideal follies. Since mankind have been continually making such mistakes in the past, is it not just possible that their political, industrial, and social systems have not as yet reached absolute perfection, and that better systems for the regulation of society may still be devised than those now in vogue?

Here, I trust, a few words in regard to myself may be excused, as showing with how little sympathy I at one time in my life regarded this hated Communism.

My early life was passed in one of the ruggedest portions of New England, where to wrench a living from the soil was no child's play. Being one of a numerous family, who were obliged to conquer a livelihood, it will not be doubted, I think, that, if my early education was deficient in other particulars, I had the opportunity of being well schooled in habits of industry and frugality. Amid surroundings where-

in the bare necessities of life are secured only by a constant struggle, rest assured, if the boy is fully developed in no other particular, he is thoroughly schooled in the art of taking care of himself. The typical New England farmer of fifty years ago was not insensible to the advantages of a good education for his children; but, paramount to this, and what the boy had strongly enforced upon his mind, was the importance of some day securing for himself a competence. Such were the teachings of my youth—wealth first and most important; though, in justice to the memory of my parents, I would state that these impressions were instilled into my mind more from my general surroundings than from any direct teachings of such a character by them. Such was the apex of desire fixed by my early education, and I will venture to assert that such is the summit of the ambition of nine-tenths of the male population of our country to-day at the age of twenty-one years; nor is such an ambition unnatural, and perhaps not discreditable, so long as this fierce competition in our industrial system exists and receives the sanction of the age. However high we may extol moral virtues or intellectual attainments, the chief aim of the multitude, under our competitive-property system, must ever be to supply their physical wants.

My own experience I believe to be the experience of the multitude in our country who have entered the arena of business life dependent upon their own exertions, their judgment, and their wit for their success. I will therefore frankly express here what my experience has been; then let others compare the same with their own, and see how widely they differ.

I have already stated the bent of my ambition when, in early life, I left the family home, which had already grown too contracted for my aspirations, and sallied forth in the almost unknown world to pluck the golden crown which I fancied would secure to me comfort, respect, power, and, in after life, ease—perhaps honor. Confiding and unsophisticated, my first experiences did not tend to favor the supreme object of my ambition; but keeping that object ever prominently in view, the lessons learned by my early mishaps subsequently became beneficial to me.

I soon found that telling the *whole* truth in a business transaction was what is termed in common business parlance being "green and unsophisticated." I learned, too, that the sure indication of a weak mind, according to public sentiment, was the harboring of any compunction of conscience about living in luxury and enjoying a superabundance of material blessings, while our fellow-beings, either from natural disqualifications or adverse circumstances, were forced to eke out a miserable existence in destitution and wretchedness. In a word, I learned that the current standard of good conduct was for each to look out for himself, regardless of the rights and happiness of others, save only to keep within the letter of the law.

It is unnecessary to trouble the reader further with my personal experiences. From the acknowledgment which I here make of the adoption of the above currently accepted business proprieties as the rule and guide of my life, it will be readily discovered how slight, at the commencement of my

business career, must have been my sympathies with Communism, or, I might say, with Humanity also, for I now regard these two words as being so closely connected as to be in a sense synonymous. A change, however, in my business situation, which gave more time and opportunity for observation, study, and reflection upon these matters, worked no little alteration in my views, as will become apparent in these pages. There is still another explanation, which it may be as well to lay before the reader.

With the confession which I have made of my early limited advantages for education, and of my active business life during a term of many years—which still prevented my acquiring anything like what is termed a liberal education—the learned will very naturally inquire how it is that I am possessed with the unwarrantable assurance of attempting to inflict upon mankind another book. To such a question, which I acknowledge would be well put, I have only to reply that I write because I have something I wish to say; and should that something be lacking in interest, or should it not be as well said as others might say it, no one is compelled to read my work. But never, perhaps, on any occasion, has human being felt a deeper sense of responsibility than that which actuates the writer as he attempts to portray to his fellow-beings that wonderful vision of futurity which has been so majestically presented to his gaze.

Bright and glorious as the youth's reflection upon the events of a gladsome fête-day does the vision in all its grandeur now rise up before me; and so deep has it impressed itself upon my mind, that it can

never be effaced, or even dimmed, while mind and memory last. I am urged on by a powerful impulse to impart what I have learned, and yet I hesitate, feeling keenly my inability to so present the matter that it may fall upon the minds of my fellow-men with that power which its importance appears to me to demand. I have, however, come to regard the performance of the task as the execution of a trust, so I must not let the admonition pass unheeded. Unheeded, did I say? Unheeded it could not pass, for whether divulged to my fellow-beings or not, I have the clearest conviction that the lifelike scenes, the seeming realities, the glorious future of humanity, so vividly laid open to my senses during the ten consecutive and eventful nights of my vision, must henceforth reign uppermost in one mind, at least, while life shall last. The contemplation is so sweet, however, that I would not have it depart. The vision I have beheld has added new zest and given a new charm to my life, while by it my faith has been strengthened in the ultimate happy destiny of mankind upon the Earth.

I would further premise that, for a few days prior to the occurrence of what I am about to relate, the injustice of mankind toward his fellows, and the inequality of the race on earth, had been to me the causes of much reflection, and of no little mental agony.

On the night of the commencement of my vision (June, 1880), I retired at my usual hour, almost utterly dejected, hopeless and wretched. I had visited on that day some of the precincts peopled by the most abject and destitute of our city's poor. I had

looked once more in anguish of heart upon their poverty, squalor, degradation, and other miseries; had observed the emaciated form, the hollow eye, and the sunken cheek, and, more than all these, had heard again that most pitiable and deplorable of all the signs of distress—the long-drawn sigh of hopeless despair.

Making more apparent and striking the contrast, I had also witnessed in the afternoon of that same day what to me was quite an unusual spectacle at the opposite verge of the social horizon. I had been a spectator at a fashionable wedding in one of our Christian churches, whose pastor and people, paradoxical as it may appear, professed to take the meek and lowly Jesus of Nazareth as the example of their lives. Arrayed in gorgeous robes, and sparkling with the most brilliant and costly of gems, these "meek and lowly" followers of the Nazarene presented a most striking contrast to that destitution I had just before witnessed; and the unequal condition of my fellow-beings on earth became more than usually apparent to my mind, putting it into that dejected and wretched condition to which I have referred upon my retirement for rest and sleep. Such was my condition upon that memorable night when I beheld a vision of Earth the most marvelous in magnitude, resplendent in beauty, and sublime in grandeur. On the succeeding morning I awoke bathed in a profuse perspiration, and with the whole night's scene as vivid before my mind as any reality I have ever witnessed. All that day I wandered abstractedly about, not being able to concentrate my thoughts upon aught but the glories I had witnessed

in my dream. My family rallied me upon my abstraction, but I did not divulge the cause, changing the subject to the best of my ability. I retired the following night, anxious and excited, as may be readily imagined, for, while feeling quite confident that the vision would reappear, I nervously dreaded its return; and yet the thought that it might not was hardly endurable. Feverish from excitement, I lay for some time wakeful, but the day's musings having been exhausting, Nature at last asserted her power, sleep came, and again I found myself in the very midst of that gorgeous scene which I had quitted so suddenly when I awoke in the morning, while the same smiling face was there also to bid me welcome that had accompanied me throughout my previous night's wanderings. Another night passed amid scenes ever-changing but glorious, every moment of the time being crowded with matters the most intensely interesting and absorbing. So passed ten consecutive nights and days; the nights with a continuance of the vision, the days in abstracted reflections of mingled pleasure and astonishment. Each of these nights was to me as years, so pregnant with life, so much did my eyes behold, so vast a field of knowledge was opened to my understanding.

Three months have elapsed before I find myself in a condition to commence a relation of what I experienced upon those memorable nights, yet every scene in these visions, every word and thought communicated, is as clear and fresh before my mind now as then. In the following chapters I shall furnish the reader, so far as I am capable, with a minute and particular narration of what I beheld.

CHAPTER II.

THE VISION.

My first experience was that of being suspended in the air, about a thousand feet above the city of my home—New York. By what means I was there suspended I know not—certainly by nothing visible—and yet it did not appear to me at the time as at all unnatural or strange.

By my side stood a sweet-faced, venerable old man, whose long, snow-white locks fell upon his shoulders, and a full white beard floated upon his breast. He wore a long robe, or gown, of snowy whiteness, which completely enveloped his person, except the feet, which were bare. His robe was buttoned under the chin, and tied with a white cord about the waist. This completed his toilet, so far as I could observe. Though ever present, accompanying me in all my wanderings, he seldom spoke. He directed my attention at times by gestures, but that which it would seem he desired me to observe and understand came to me as by intuition. I felt, while in his presence, no overwhelming sense of contact with a being superhuman, neither did instantaneous flight to and from portions of country far remote, which I often experienced, or in fact anything which I beheld or which occurred during my vision, at the time, appear to me strange or wonderful, but all

seemed natural and normal as the daily avocations and experiences to which I had been accustomed. Neither did this first exclamation from the happy-faced old man: "Come with me, and I will show you the Republic of the Future," fall strangely upon my ear. I felt as a child or a pupil might feel who is about to be taught great things in the most natural manner possible. Upon making the explanation as given above, the old man pointed below. I looked as he directed, and magnificent indeed was the scene that met my eyes.

Across the waters of the bay I gazed, with the Jersey shore extending along my right, over on the green fields and hills of Staten Island and down through the Narrows, until the white-caps of Old Ocean fell upon my view; then tracing the shore of Long Island, on my left, past the city which lay spread out beneath my feet, far up along the narrow waters of the Sound to the northeast, I gazed in wonder. Turning, with my face to the north, and tracing the noble old Hudson up along the line of the Palisades, suddenly a light flashed upon my mind, and excitedly I broke forth with the exclamation: "It is—it is New York; but oh! how changed!"

I will now give a description of the beautiful metamorphosed city which lay spread out before my eyes. I shall confine my description, however, for the present, principally to the external appearance of the city as it presented a bird's-eye view from my point of observation; noting further on other important matters which, I trust, may be of interest to the reader. I shall be particular in describing the gen-

eral plan and construction of the city, as it appeared to me from my aerial point of observation, for the reason that, except with some differences required by its natural construction, I found New York to be almost a counterpart of all the other cities of the Republic.

Extending in a semicircular form around the lower portion of the island, up about as far as would mark the two extremities, if extended from river to river, of what is now Canal street, were erected stone piers of the most substantial masonry, alongside of which lay moored, as now, the shipping from every portion of the globe. A street one hundred feet wide, stone-paved in the most substantial manner (as were all the streets in the business portion of the city), extended around the entire semicircle adjoining these stone piers. Along the inner circle of this street (except at intervals of two hundred feet, through which ran cross-streets fifty feet in width) were warehouses in solid blocks, four stories high and one hundred feet deep, built wholly of brick. Along the rear of these warehouses ran another street fifty feet in width, and then came another line of warehouses precisely like those in front, which extended also around the entire semicircle contiguous to the piers.

Along the inner circle of the last-mentioned warehouses ran a street two hundred feet in width. Railway tracks extended around the entire semicircle through all the streets, and cars were run along beside the warehouses for the purpose of loading and unloading. The lower portion of the area of this semicircle, within the inner line of the

streets, was occupied for railway purposes, the works covering several acres of ground. Here were passenger and freight depots, engine and car-houses, machine shops, and all the paraphernalia requisite for the outfit and prosecution of this important enterprise.

Near what is now the northwest corner of City Hall Park stood an immense granite building four stories high called Commerce Hall. I would state that while various kinds of material were used for the construction of the public buildings, all others were built invariably of brick. No prescribed mode of architecture was followed in the construction of the public buildings; gracefulness and elegance of style were undoubtedly sought for, but utility and durability were never sacrificed to show.

Some thirty rods east of Commerce Hall was another large building called the Sailors' Home, and a home it was, indeed, for the gallant tars assembled from around the broad earth. At a point near what is now West Broadway and Canal street were clusters of school buildings. The remaining portion of the area within the semicircle formed by the streets and warehouses before described, both below Commerce Hall and above, extending to what is now called Canal street, was covered by a garden, which, as it appeared upon my first view, blooming in the bright sunshine of a June morning, might well vie in glory with that ever-memorable garden of old which has been so glowingly described by the poets. Further on I shall again take occasion to refer to this garden, when I shall picture it more minutely to the reader.

Along the northern border of the garden—that is, along what is now called Canal street—ran an avenue two hundred feet wide, reaching from river to river, called Park avenue, on either side of which, at intervals of one hundred feet, as also through the center, extended a row of magnificent old elms. Above Park avenue, embraced within the area of a line at right-angles with this street, the eastern boundary being near what is now called the Bowery, and the western boundary near Hudson street, and extending north as far as what is now Forty-second street, stood the dwellings and many of the public buildings of the city. In the center of a plot of ground containing one acre, contiguous to Park avenue, and on a line a little east of what is now Broadway, stood a four-story structure occupied for post, telegraph, and telephone offices. Adjoining this to the west, on a plot of ground of the same dimensions, stood the Museum, a large, four-story building also. Across the street, directly north of the two buildings last-named, on plots of ground containing also one acre each, stood a theater, and a public library building which contained a large public hall and reading-rooms. The grounds about all the above-named buildings were beautifully laid out and adorned with shrubs and flowers. Crossing the street above the last-described grounds and buildings, we came to the grounds of Science Hall, an elegant and capacious granite edifice four stories high. The grounds about this magnificent structure occupied an area of many acres, laid out in beautiful lawns, shaded with majestic old trees, and embellished with the choicest flowering shrubs and plants. On the opposite side of the street, still north above

Science Hall, was located another theater and an opera house. These buildings had each an area of one acre of ground allotted them, also, which was elegantly laid out and adorned (as were, for that matter, the grounds about all the public buildings and dwellings of the city), with well-kept walks and grass plots, as well as trees, shrubs, and flowers in great variety and beauty. Still above the latter-mentioned buildings, north, and each in its allotted space of one acre, we find two more public edifices: one the Art Gallery, and the other a second library building, with reading-rooms, lecture halls, etc. North of these again, on the same line, was a cluster of school buildings constructed upon a more extensive scale than those before mentioned, including as they did the higher universities of the city. Other clusters of school buildings were also located among the dwellings at each side of the area, on which the public buildings stood, about on a line with what is now Twenty-third street.

To make the schools in the highest degree efficient no expense was spared either in the construction of buildings or in their working appointments. Different buildings represented the several grades, from the primary to the highest university degree. Ample space of ground was assigned to each of these buildings, a portion of which was set off for playgrounds and athletic games, and another portion for shady lawns, etc. The school buildings, which I mentioned as lying north of the Art Gallery and Library, extended up to what was called College avenue, near where is our present Forty-second street.

To the east and west of the area on which were

erected the public buildings, stood, as I have said, the dwellings. These faced beautifully-shaded streets, one hundred and fifty feet wide and macadamized, as were all the streets in the city except those mentioned as stone-paved, fronting the warehouses. To each dwelling was assigned two acres of ground, and that portion not occupied by the buildings was laid out partly in fruit and flower gardens and partly in lawns for the purpose of recreation and exercise in such games as croquet, lawn tennis, archery, and other pleasant outdoor diversions.

The dwellings were four stories high, and of ample capacity for the accommodation of from two hundred to three hundred people. Their general construction was all after one model, an extension running back at right-angles from each end of the main or front building, leaving a court within which opened to the grounds in the rear.

A wide piazza, roofed, and upon a level with the first or ground floor, extended entirely around the building. On the ground floor were large parlors, reception rooms, a large dining-hall, and also reading, smoking, and billiard rooms. On the second and third floors the rooms were large and airy, and constructed mostly in suites, with a view to family convenience and privacy. The fourth floor was divided into smaller apartments, suited for one or two individuals. These dwellings were lighted by gas and heated by steam, as were also the public buildings.

To the east and west of the dwellings were market houses, buildings assigned to the mechanical trades, printing-offices, etc. Behind these were stables, and, back of these still, vegetable and fruit gardens, ex-

tending down to the river on each side of the city. Along the East river, above Park avenue, were the docks where vessels were repaired, and opposite, along the North river side, were large grain elevators. Commencing at a point on College avenue, near what is now Third avenue, was a street of unsurpassed magnificence, two hundred feet wide, which extended in a semicircular form around the whole upper end of the island, intersecting College avenue again at a point in a line with what is now Ninth avenue. Central avenue, a street of the same width and beauty as Grand avenue, commenced at a point on College avenue midway between the two lower termini of Grand avenue, and ran north nearly through the center of the island, intersecting Grand avenue at the extreme northern arc of the semicircle. Cross-streets connecting Grand avenue on each side were laid out at intervals of half a mile. Grand and Central avenues were each divided into three sections, one hundred feet in the center being macadamized for general driving, fifty feet adjoining made suitable for fast driving, and fifty feet on the opposite side of the main drive was for equestrian purposes Between these divisions were rows of hedge, and at each outer side was a row of shade-trees.

At the northeast corner of College and Central avenues stood a Deaf and Dumb Asylum, and opposite, on the northwest corner of the above-mentioned avenues, an Asylum for the Blind. On Central avenue, north of the latter building, was a Hospital, to which ample space was afforded, and the grounds of which were adorned in the usual manner.

East of the Deaf and Dumb Asylum and the Hos-

pital, running to Grand avenue, were several acres appropriated for exercise and play grounds. West of the Blind Asylum, in the area between Central and Grand avenues, was a monster Riding Academy. Within the semicircle of Grand avenue, at the extreme upper portion of the island, was the City Cemetery. Adjoining this, south, and extending for a mile or so, was a wood stretching from river to river.

High Bridge and the reservoirs in the Central Park remained as now, the little lakes now in the park also. The remaining portion of the island not mentioned particularly here was devoted principally to agriculture.

I have now given, I think, a tolerably fair outline of the general construction and appearance of the city.

I saw, from my elevated point of observation, people laboring in the fields, walking and riding in the streets, playing and strolling in the gardens, while everything wore the appearance of animated life; and as for order, regularity, and beauty, nothing which I have ever witnessed in the laying out and construction of a city bears any comparison to it. Such was New York, and such substantially was the scene I beheld, where our city now stands, upon the first night of my vision.

It will be asked, perhaps, Where were the churches, the prisons, the court buildings, etc.? some thinking, perchance, that I have forgotten these. No, I have not forgotten them; there were none, and no need for them. Crime was unknown, and mankind had

learned that temples for religious worship exclusively were needless.

We did not descend into the city the first night of my vision, but after taking the bird's-eye view of the city, which has now been outlined, we passed on in our explorations; and what I further beheld will be described in a succeeding chapter.

The reader will now pardon a short digression, I trust, to enable the writer to speak briefly of that famous spot upon which stood the beautiful garden of his vision. It is to this spot only as the seat of one of those famous *Schools of Spoliation* of which our world, under the Private Property system, is now so prolific, and to what appertained to that school, that my remarks will be confined.

Through the establishment of this school there arose upon the site of the beautiful garden of my vision a conglomeration of so much that would have been uncalled for under a proper order of things; so much that was hideous to the sight; so much that was iniquitous and revolting to the nobler instincts of the human soul.

The whole area upon which stood the garden of my vision had formerly been occupied by huge and often unseemly piles of brick and mortar, iron and stone, put up to-day to be torn down to-morrow, with a sacrifice of labor which is simply incalculable. Side by side with the stately edifices and the luxurious surroundings wherein the shrewd banker, railway magnate, or merchant, concocted his schemes for spoliation upon a huge scale, and in a manner regarded as very respectable, stood the rum-shop, the gambling-house, the brothel, and every other con-

ceivable vile den, where the art of spoliation was practiced upon wholly unscrupulous principles; and so while the higher classes flourished here by fleecing their victims in the most approved style, the gambler took a shorter cut to the accomplishment of the same object; the rum-seller throve by the sale of his poisons; the courtesan walked the streets shamelessly plying her vocation; the burglar made bold strikes for his booty; and the assassin, lurking in dark places, gained his ends by the death of his victim.

Upon this very spot were gathered together, age after age, tens and hundreds of thousands of human beings whose chief object it was to raise themselves to affluence and power at the expense of society at large.

It may be safely asserted that no school which it was ever in the power of man to devise could have been more efficient than this for sharpening the wits of mankind, and developing to the highest attainable degree all the "pure cussedness" there is in human nature. Talk of shrewdness, cunning, wariness, and desperation! Why, no fox ever approached the hen-roost with lighter footsteps, watched more warily the movements of his intended victim, or pounced upon him at the favored opportunity with greater celerity or fury, than the merest freshman in this celebrated School for acquiring the arts of Spoliation approached his fellow-man, cautiously bided his time until the vantage ground was his, and then made short work of stripping his victim of his property. For specious arts of cunning and deceit; for petty modes of getting the better of their fellows; for bold and far-reaching schemes of adventure, whereby prodigious wealth was brought into their coffers; for covering their black

deeds beneath robes of religious sanctity; and for petty crime, as well for the most bold, defiant, black-hearted, and desperate villainy, no people upon the face of the earth, probably, have ever excelled those educated in this famous school. Many, ingenious, and subtle were the ways devised and resorted to by the higher classes for appropriating to themselves the fruits of toil. But the lower classes, more oppressed by immediate wants, less shrewd or prudent, perhaps, or regarding somewhat contemptuously the hypocritical measures resorted to by the higher classes in their process of spoliation, were inclined to be more direct in their appropriations; hence they often found themselves within the clutches of the law, a position which the higher classes were usually successful in avoiding.

And so here, in this efficient university of vice, was generated in countless thousands every description of the most debased and wretched of human characters, who made not only the precincts upon which rests our lovely garden a very hell upon earth, but forth from their iniquitous surroundings issued in huge swarms the most desperate of wretches, to roam and practice their villainies over the wide world.

Behold now the change! Here, in my vision, the birds sing, and the squirrels gambol in the branches of majestic oaks, whose ivy-bound trunks have withstood the north wind's blast for ages. Here the graceful elm, with branches spreading wide, casts its shadow on the close-cropped lawn, and beneath its shade rests many a peaceful soul whiling the happy hours away. Here, also, are a few noble specimens of the white pine, stretching their lofty tops high

up into the blue vault which overarches them, while, amid their branches, the soft winds whisper and sigh in fitting response to the whispers and sighs of the lovers that sit beneath. The silver-leafed maple, too, is here, besides many other varieties of native forest trees that are exceedingly graceful and beautiful. Here, also, are exotics, some few even of a tropical origin, notably the magnolia and the palmetto, denoting that our climate has changed alike with our city. And beneath this canopy of noble forest trees is laid out with the most exquisite taste velvety lawns, traversed by elegant walks, bordered with flowering shrubs and plants of almost endless variety, which, at the time of my vision, were clothed in all their glory. Statues, not of great warriors who had acquired temporary renown through the slaughter of their fellow-men, but of noble men and women, who lived and died in bygone days to better the condition of their kind, stand here and there upon many a favored site. Fountains of exquisite beauty are also a notable feature of our garden, while frequently may be seen the light cascade, so skilfuly designed and executed as to vie in handiwork with nature itself.

Above, below, and on the spot where once the somber prison rose, a placid lake lies shimmering beneath the bright sun's rays, while softly over its rippling waves floats many a tiny craft with happy mortals laden low, who throw their banners to the breeze, while sounds of merry voices strike the ear, and strains of music soft and sweet rise up in mingled melody and float away upon the summer air.

Yes, this upon the very spot where once the dolor-

ous "Tombs" so oft had closed her massive gates, and slid their bolts, against the sunshine, peace, joy, and hope of sorrowing man. The very spot this is where once the gallows had been reared, and barbarous laws had ruthlessly deprived man of that which is not his to give or justly to take, making the crime a double one—the murderer's and the people's.

Thank heaven, such scenes of horror and of woe have long gone by—have passed away with the private property system, the wretched mother that gave them birth.

Such, in brief, are a few of the leading characteristics of our garden, a more extended description of which I must refrain from giving here. But there was still another charm attending it, more glorious than all that art could produce, which may not be passed unnoticed.

I refer to the indications, yes, in truth, the universal assurances, of happiness and content, which made themselves so apparent upon every hand. There was not observable in all this assembled throng the slightest evidence of poverty or want; not a slovenly or poorly-clad individual was to be met. Nor was there any outward show of extravagance in apparel, or of individual magnificence in any form. Neither was there manifested any sign of self-aggrandizement, nor of self-abasement in any manner whatever. All associated upon terms of mutual respect and equality.

Nor was there any sign of intemperance, of wantonness, of slothfulness, of injustice, of inhumanity—in short, of any impropriety or evil of any kind whatever. All things, in truth, bore the most unmistakable evidence that mankind had at length

attained that high altitude of human possibility in which the soul may rest in peace. Human beings now looked into the faces of their kind confidingly, trustfully, lovingly. There was no longer any wrong to be concealed, or anything of which one might be ashamed or afraid, for mankind were honest and pure.

I need not go further. As the glimpse of an earthly Paradise and of a perfect society has now been partially foreshadowed, here I shall leave my Eden to the contemplation of my readers.

But would the reader ask for the *cause* of the wonderful change that had taken place in the great metropolitan city of the Western Hemisphere? It may be given in a sentence. It was the abolition of the system of Individual Property, and the devising, instituting, and establishing in its stead of a property system which made justice between man and man not only possible, but the interest and pleasure of each and all.

CHAPTER III.

THE VISION.—CONTINUED.

HAVING taken a bird's-eye survey of New York, we now commence our aerial flight to the east. Passing over the East River, I observed that where now stands the city of Brooklyn, as throughout all Long Island, were charming fields of grass and grain, with groups of buildings here and there, half hidden by grand old trees, while flowers innumerable, and of many a varied hue, lit up and crowned the glorious scene.

A double-track railway ran through the center of the island as far as Riverhead; the tracks diverging here, one running to the northern and the other to the southern extremity of the two forks of the island. Prominent highways running north and south, east and west, and crossing at right-angles at a uniform distance of three miles, extended, wherever practical, throughout the entire area of the island. These roads, which were macadamized and in excellent condition, were shaded by trees at regular distances and bordered by hedges.

Midway between these more prominent highways, and running parallel with them, were inferior roads, constructed for convenience in reaching the lands. Each tract of land of three miles square belonged to a community, the dwellings and other buildings of

which were grouped in the center at the intersection of the principal highways.

A portion of each of these community-tracts was set off to forest, while here and there, where practicable through natural adaptation, shone the bright waters of some little artificial lake.

With these exceptions, the whole area of the island was now devoted to agricultural purposes, and was cultivated on scientific principles.

Under an intelligent system of irrigation, even the now apparent barren pine-lands had been made fairly productive.

Here was now presented to my eye, in the vision, a scene of beauty, order, and thrift, as yet unparalleled upon the earth, and all of which had been the legitimate result of regulating industrial enterprises under a harmonious system of human forethought, design, and intelligence.

Extending our aerial flight eastward, my eyes wandered continually over vast fields of grass and grain, now waving gently in the summer's breeze, the rich-hued corn, in long, straight rows, bending gracefully to earth, while the many other varieties of vegetable productions, flourishing luxuriantly, lent interest and beauty to the scene. The order and beauty of the landscape, divided into equal areas by the highways, and bordered by trees and hedges; the patches of forest and the shining lakes; the elegance of the community buildings, and the taste in which the grounds were laid out and decorated about them—gave to all the land the finish and the beauty of an immense but exquisitely designed and highly cultivated garden.

I will now describe the community-groups or clusters of buildings that rose up before my eyes, which were substantial copies of the multitudinous community-groups that now dotted the whole land.

Occupying the most prominent and eligible position within an angle of the two principal highways, stood the community dwelling, which was modeled and laid out in grounds precisely like those of the community dwellings I have already described as seen in the city of New York. On a corner opposite the dwelling in each community-group stood a building called Library Hall.

About four acres of ground was usually appropriated to its purposes, a space of one hundred feet in front on each street being tastefully laid out in walks and lawns, and decorated with flowering shrubs and plants. The grounds back were set off partly for exercise and play-grounds, and partly for garden-lawn, amid which wound serpentine walks bordered with flowering shrubs and plants, while here and there some noble forest-tree provided ample shade.

Library Hall, which was built of brick, as were the country-buildings generally, differed somewhat in size in the different communities, according to the numbers of the community-members. It was invariably built after one model, however, with post, telegraph, and telephone offices, and a library and reading-room, on the first floor; and a lecture-hall, which had also its stage for theatrical performances, on the floor above.

On a corner opposite Library Hall was the School building, with ample grounds, which were appropriately laid out and decorated with much elegance.

On the remaining corner was a building assigned to mechanical purposes, in which were apartments for the carpenter, mason, painter, blacksmith, wheelwright, harness-maker, etc., etc. A little to the rear, in each group, was also a building, assigned to some sort of manufacturing purpose, to afford employment to the community members during inclement weather, and at such portions of the year as they could not be profitably employed in agricultural pursuits.

Beside the above-mentioned buildings, there were also ample barns and stables built upon the most approved plan; and now and then among the group might be seen a steam-mill for grinding grain.

Such was the community-group; and for beauty of design, elegance of construction, neatness, convenience, and utility in all its appointments, no village of the present day would begin to bear a favorable comparison with it. I have been somewhat particular in describing the scene which met my view upon Long Island, as the general plan laid out and followed was substantially the same as that which marked every other portion of the New Republic.

Of course, the whole land was not laid out with the same regularity as was the island, for there were mountains, lakes, and rivers to prevent; but in so far as this general plan was practicable, I found that it had been adhered to closely. Having now viewed Long Island, I found myself hovering again over the identical spot in the city where my vision had commenced; and, while my eyes were resting with delight upon the New York described in a previous chapter, I awoke suddenly, to find myself again surrounded

by all that conglomeration of disorder and imbecility that goes to make up the New York of to-day.

Is it to be marveled at that I wandered all that day abstracted and forgetful of all my surroundings, or that the New York and the beautiful adjacent island that I had beheld in my vision, as well as the sweet face of the old man who had been my constant companion during the night's vision, should ever stand prominent by before my eyes? All this day my agitation of mind was great, while ruminating upon what I had seen, and speculating upon the probable return of my vision. Return it did, however, and took up the scene precisely where it had ended the previous morning.

During this and the two subsequent nights, we were exploring the whole North American continent, starting each night from our former elevated position over New York, thence proceeding directly to a point which we had quitted the previous morning; and so we continued in our explorations until we had traversed the whole land.

Let us here take a sweeping view that will convey to the mind of the reader a general idea of the glories which my eyes beheld. Afterward I will dwell a little more upon particulars. Let the eye of the imagination sweep over the entire North American continent. Observe first those long lines of double-track railways, rarely diverging, but pointing onward in an almost direct line; cutting down hills and leveling up vales; leaping the rivers and the smaller lakes; extending in unbroken lines across broad valleys, and tunneling mountains, until, connecting ocean with ocean, they span the whole vast land. If

the eye is quick, and tolerably accurate in measuring distances, it will notice that these long lines of railways run parallel, that they are situated about fifty miles apart, and that they extend from about the twentieth to the sixtieth degree north latitude.

You will observe, also, that, cutting these railways at right-angles, and at about the same distance apart, is also a transverse system of double-track railways, running north and south, thus gridironing the whole land. I have only to remark here of these railways, that they were constructed in the most substantial manner; that all their appointments were of the highest order; that accidents on or about them seldom occurred; and, moreover, that they belonged to the commonwealth.

Now, having caught a glimpse of the vast railway system, let the reader in the mind's eye transfer to this whole land that entire general system which I have described as existing upon Long Island, and he will have the picture before him tolerably complete. Would he behold the scene in all its glory, let him not forget the uniform system of highways adorned with trees and hedges; the highly cultivated fields; the patches of forest and the silver lakes; the gardens and the orchards; and the groups of community buildings, models of neatness, comfort and elegance, nestling beneath the shade of grand old trees, vine-embowered and fragrant with the perfume of flowers, that studded the whole earth as the stars the heavens.

Let him, in the imagination, extend this almost fairy-scene over the major portion of the vast landed domain of the North American continent, and he

may form a very correct idea of that paradise that I beheld in my vision. But the "beauty and majesty of earth," laid out, cultivated, and adorned under the highest system of art, "mingled in harmony on Nature's face," is not so easily grasped by the imagination; yet once seen, as it has been my privilege to behold it, and not even the heavens themselves in all their glory are more impressive. The remembrance of this glorious scene gives me the grandest conception of the possibilities of man—of that high and noble destiny which awaits him upon the earth.

Men will tell us, no doubt, that what I picture is but a fairy-scene, born in the imagination of some visionary enthusiast, and that a realization of this conception is impossible. Whisper it not to me. That grand panorama which rose nightly before my eyes; those momentous hours so pregnant with life that they seemed to expand into years, so much did I mix with and learn of the inner life and customs of the people by whom I was surrounded; the order with which all things were exhibited to my view; the clear, full sense of reality with which everything was made apparent; the clearness and precision with which were presented to me so many important matters pertaining to the welfare of man, and at times descending into detail upon what would appear minor matters, as will be seen hereafter—all these things, I affirm, *mean something*, and have inspired me with a faith that admits not of doubt that the picture I have beheld foreshadows that which is ultimately to be a reality.

We shall be told, probably, that the vast system of railways and highways which I have marked out

would involve an amount of labor in their construction so herculean as to be practically beyond the bounds of human accomplishment.

My purpose at present is to state what I saw, and what was taught me during the nights of my vision, not to go into particulars regarding the causes which led to so wonderful a transformation.

But long before such a transformation becomes a reality, wars will have ceased, and a new industrial system will have been established. When this period shall have arrived, the united efforts of mankind will soon work the most wonderful changes upon the earth. In fact, the literal transformation of the earth to a degree of utility and excellence equal to what I have here portrayed, is not only, I believe, possible, but, with the vastly multiplied increase of population that is yearly taking place, it will eventually be impossible for all to be sustained without some such preparation.

I will now speak a little more particularly of the changes which had been wrought, confining these more to their several localities. The almost unbroken forest of what is now called British America had been cleared, and was under a high state of cultivation. And here I would remark that the change which had taken place in the climate of our country had been almost equal to the other changes. The temperature of the higher latitudes had become milder, while that of the tropics was cooler; and this, without doubt, was the effect of the changes upon the earth's surface. The greater portion of this northern territory, being by nature well adapted

to the new system of improvements, there being few natural impediments to the construction of railways, highways, and the locating of community-groups with much uniformity and order, this vast area of forest had literally been transformed into a beautiful garden. But I was particularly impressed, in passing over the continent, with the wonderful changes that had been wrought upon the earth's surface in that portion of the land with which I had been most familiar.

New England presented changes that were truly astonishing. Where practicable, the highways had been regularly laid out and graded, and the lands had been smoothed and graded to a considerable extent, small eminences having been pared down, and rocks removed to fill up the hollows and to build fences. Literally, the crooked had been made straight, and the rough way smooth. And through the improvements, the country, rugged as it was by nature, had been made to produce many fold more than it produced in the days of my childhood. Parts of the more rugged and mountainous portions, however, had been given wholly over to that to which they were by nature best adapted, namely, the growth of timber. Hence, the severe droughts now so frequent, and which are the natural result of the destruction of our forests, at the time of which I here speak were unknown in the land.

Of course, in some portions of New England, as in some other portions of our land, there were natural impediments which prevented that close uniformity in the construction of the railways and highways, and the location of the community-groups, which I

have mentioned as existing upon Long Island, but wherever these barriers occurred, the general plan was followed as closely as practicable. It did seem marvelous, I confess, that so close a conformity to the general plan in the construction of such wonderful improvements as I found here could have been executed so successfully in that rugged and mountainous portion of our land, extending throughout our Eastern borders as far south as Georgia.

These mountain ranges were traversed by the railways at about the regular intervals of fifty miles, in an easterly and westerly direction, and the departure of the northerly and southerly lines from the regular system was not great, while the highways and the community clusters conformed much closer to the general plan than would now be regarded as possible.

But it was in passing on into the great valley of the Mississippi beyond that I came more fully to realize the inestimable advantages of a systematized plan for the improvement, cultivation, and adornment of the earth. Here was an area of country extending from the Appalachian chain of mountains at the east to the Rocky Mountains at the west, from the great lakes at the north to the Gulf of Mexico at the south, and embracing millions of square miles, that offered few natural impediments to the adoption of this great plan. Nature had here furnished the opportunity for making the grand design practical upon a majestic scale, and well had it been improved. The most magnificent scene ever presented to the eye of man lay spread out before my vision. With a diversity of climate that rendered natural the productions

of both the torrid and temperate zones, with a soil that throughout the greater portion of this whole vast area was the most wonderfully exuberant, all that was here required was that intelligent system of improvements and cultivation, which, happily, had now been bestowed upon it, to transform this immense domain, hitherto but partially and very imperfectly cultivated, into one grand, magnificent garden spot, constituting in its stupendous whole a land of plenty and of beauty unsurpassed in the legends of fable or in the conceptions of the imagination. The Rocky Mountains, of course, presented another obstacle to the general plan, but these, too, had been pierced at several points by the railways to reach the country beyond. Passing this mountain range, we are brought face to face with a transformation equally as wonderful as that presented in the valley of the Mississippi. Over a great portion of that vast plateau lying between the Rocky Mountains and the Sierra Nevada and Cascade ranges, and stretching from the Arctic Ocean on the north to the Isthmus of Panama on the south, had been established the new system of railways, highways, and the community-groups. Over much of this once desert waste, where the sage-bush and the mesquit-tree were formerly the sole production, vegetation was now even luxuriant, and gave sustenance to a vast population.

The principal causes which had given rise to the wonderful change of soil in this portion of the land was irrigation, and a rain supply which had constantly increased from year to year, after irrigation had com-

menced, and forests began to grow over the irrigated territory.

Through the adoption of the new system by California, her big "bonanza farms" were transformed into luxuriant fields and gardens of fruits and flowers, unsurpassed in all the earth, thus crowning with happiness a people whose ancestors, to their praise be it said, had been among the foremost in their efforts to shake off a property system that had nearly crushed the young state in its infancy.

Having now, I trust, given the reader a pretty general idea of the external appearance of our continent, as it lay stretched out so beautifully and grandly before my eyes during the first few nights of my vision, I shall make a few more general remarks closely related to the subject, and then bring this part of my story to a close. I observed that the rivers and lakes were navigated to some extent, as now, but the canals had been abandoned, and the railways were the principal means of conveyance and transportation. There were but few cities compared in numbers with those of the present day. Those for commercial purposes, by which I have reference to such as did business with foreign countries, were scattered along both coasts of the continent as required, wherever there were suitable harbors. There were also cities scattered here and there over the interior, for convenience in the distribution of commodities. In New England and other hill districts, where the facilities for water-power were advantageous, some exclusively manufacturing communities were located, but manufacturing, as a rule, was carried on in connection with agriculture.

I would further remark that decorating and beautifying the earth's surface, at the time of which I am speaking, seemed to be almost as important as was the cultivation of the soil. Shade-trees not only lined the highways, but were to be seen in every other available spot where their presence would add comfort, and of flowers there seemed to be no end. Not only the gardens, but the buildings and the fences, were radiant in their splendor, from early spring until late autumn in portions where there was frost, and perpetually where frost was unknown.

Such, in brief, was the picture which was spread out before me, and upon which my eyes feasted in amazement and joy during the first four nights of my vision.

Who shall say that the scene was not magnificent, sublime? And could one but share my faith that what I saw in my vision would ultimately become a *reality*, would not his heart beat with renewed hopes for the future of his race?

CHAPTER IV.

PRESENT EXTERNAL APPEARANCE OF OUR REPUBLIC.

In the preceding chapters I have briefly but faintly pictured the external appearance of the North American continent as it lay spread out before me in my vision; depicting thereby, though in a very imperfect manner, the transformation which, I believe, is ultimately to be consummated in our land, through well-devised, well-formulated systems, and the combined action of its inhabitants.

The picture referred to, as seen in my vision, will no doubt be regarded by most as utopian; but if utopian, it can hardly be regarded, I think, as beyond the possibilities of human attainment. None will dispute that the picture I have drawn might be reached, and even far surpassed, in reality, were the proper means adopted for the attainment of such an end.

I will not stop to enlarge upon these side issues, however, but will direct the reader's attention to that which I regard as far more important.

It is my purpose, in this work, to endeavor to demonstrate the impossibility of attaining, in the aggregate, to a state of existence that may be properly regarded as in any degree exalted, either materially, intellectually, socially, or morally, under the hitherto dominant basic society principles and customs de-

rived from selfish, incoherent, haphazard, inharmonious, individual effort. To this end, I shall make it a special feature of this work to illustrate the hitherto abortive attempts in the above-named direction, by contrasting the existing conditions with those pictured to me in my vision; regarding the latter, as I do, as unquestionably within the possibilities of man's attainments.

No doubt the wonderful variance between the external appearance of our Republic of the Future, as beheld in my vision, and the present state of things, has presented itself quite clearly to the mind of the reader from the brief description of the former already given; nevertheless, a few moments may not be spent unprofitably in pointing out a few of what I regard as the more objectionable, absurd, ill-devised, and ill-constructed human institutions that have been the direct outcome of individual effort; or, in other words, that have arisen without concurrent design and action upon the part of the race.

I am aware that my opinions and convictions relative to what are properly individual and what are society functions differ widely from the modern scientific teachings of the day, now quite popular, advocated by Herbert Spencer and his followers. Nevertheless, my own convictions have not been shaken in the least by any arguments which they have thus far presented upon the subject.

The teaching of this school of scientific philosophers, if I rightly understand them, is that society has no further function than to protect the individual in his natural rights; and, this accomplished, the progress of the race must then be left to individual

effort, or at most to such effort as may be made by coteries of individuals co-operating in the pursuit of their own personal interests.

My own opinion upon this matter is quite the opposite of this: I believe that procedure under this haphazard plan of individual effort is akin to barbarism, and that most of the progress which has hitherto been made by the race has been attained in proportion as man has departed from this method. Morever, I affirm that the race has been held in check, and its advancement thwarted and paralyzed to a fearful extent, by this individual method of procedure.

In my belief, the highest possibilities attainable by the human race can be reached only through *united effort;* and to this end, after much study and contemplation, I can conceive of no plan which appears to me so feasible as the banding together in communities.

It is true that all ideas and projects must first originate in the individual brain, but to adopt and utilize these projects as worthy and beneficial, or reject them as unworthy and detrimental to human progress and happiness, should be the prerogative of those who may be chosen by the majority as the wisest and best fitted for such purposes.

It must be conceded that without united effort to some extent upon the part of mankind, little, if any, progress could ever have been made toward civilization. It follows, then, as a corollary that the more complete and ample the system established for such united effort, the greater and more efficient will be the results.

A further fact, as I believe, and which I hope to demonstrate satisfactorily to all in the course of this work, is that the widest and most complete individual liberty which it is possible to grant or secure to a civilized people may be reached through a community system similar at least to that advocated in these pages.

The few foregoing remarks have been made in order to lay before the reader the ground-work of my theory for substituting a system whereby the united efforts of the wisest heads may be utilized for promoting the welfare of the race, so that this principle of every man for himself shall no longer continue.

As the question here raised, which may be defined in brief as disjointed individual effort, in contrast with a well-devised system of combined effort, will be illustrated and treated of throughout this entire work, it is unnecessary to enlarge further in a general way upon the subject here. Taking, then, for my standard of comparison, what was presented to me in my vision, I will now proceed to call the reader's attention to a few of the more important of the many existing things which meet the eye upon every hand, not only in the great city of New York, but in all great commercial cities, and which are totally inadequate, unsightly, and as a rule superfluous.

But first, in order to judge of what may be regarded as uncalled for and superfluous, it is necessary to determine in our minds what are the legitimate uses and functions of a commercial city.

Upon this question, I hold that a commercial city has no other normal or legitimate function than

simply to act as a factor in the exportation, importation, and, within a given radius, which will hereafter be defined, the exchange of commodities. Consequently, all existing appendages not requisite to the fulfilment of such legitimate functions are abnormal and unnecessary.

Now imagining ourselves suspended over the great city of New York, as in my vision, let us note what a bird's-eye view would present to us.

Instead of the grand panorama which lay spread out before me in my vision, one would behold a huge mass of inorganic matter gathered together without order or system, more than half of which would be useless and the remainder ill-adapted to the legitimate requirements of a well-devised, well-ordered city.

In a harbor beautiful and complete as any that nature has ever constructed lies shipping from every portion of the globe, tied up to long rows of old, rotten, dilapidated, tumble-down wharves, that would be of no special credit to a little inland river town in the wilds of Africa or Siberia.

Turning from the piers, the lover of order and utility is no better satisfied in casting his eyes along the huge and compact piles of brick and mortar, iron and stone, that rise up in long rows and in all shapes that it seems possible for the imagination of man to conceive of, or upon which blind chance could stumble.

From an elevated position, one looks down almost in wonder that all this ponderous mass does not sink our little island down, down, far down into the black Tartarus below.

The earth, the forest, the mines, and the "rock-ribbed hills" for a thousand miles around have been forced to pay high tribute toward the construction of these varied monuments of the ingenuity and energy of man, as also of his asinine stupidity and folly.

Row after row, and mile after mile, stretch out these unseemly piles, rarely relieved by touch of nature's hand in tree, or sod, or flower. In the busiest portion of the city, where ample space for air and locomotion is most indispensable, you may catch glimpses now and then of narrow crevices, sunk down amid this ponderous mass, dignified by the name of streets.

Approach near enough to obtain a view of these, and you will find that they are not only contracted, but that they are exceedingly badly paved and filthy, and that the stench from the garbage and refuse from innumerable kitchens rises up from out the gutters, while a thousand other nuisances poison the atmosphere with their noxious vapors, opening wide the flood-gates of disease and death upon ten thousand homes.

Moreover, you will see in these pig-lanes, dignified by the name of streets, mixed in inextricable confusion, a conglomerate mass of vehicles, beasts of burden, and human beings, crowding, jostling, and pushing their way along, amid such an intolerable uproar and confusion as to be suggestive far more of Dante's infernal regions than of a well-ordered and well-regulated commercial city. And yet, with all this elbowing and crowding, we are still compelled to rise above *terra-firma* to find room for locomotion; and so we have many of our streets over-arched with

railways, increasing the din and confusion until there is left no peace for the sick, or rest for the weary; the effect of which is to drive all except the most iron-nerved to the very verge of insanity. Further up the city, the scene changes somewhat, and we find more order and regularity with less confusion. Along near the longitudinal center of the island rise the palatial mansions of our Crœsuses, not unseemly to look upon, we will confess. On either side stand the less pretentious dwellings of the middle class, while a little further removed from the sacred precincts of the great appropriators may be found the wretched hovels of their victims. Scattered here and there, all about amid this conglomerate mass, rise hundreds of factories, breweries, and other nuisances, the smoke and stench from which still further pollute the air. High, overtopping all, crop out the many church-steeples, proclaiming that below, in solemn grandeur, stand magnificent temples, erected and embellished by enormous labor, ostensibly as places for the worship of one whose life, and the whole spirit of whose teachings, were in direct conflict with all waste, display, and folly. How different from all this that beautiful semicircle of my vision, with its stone piers, encircled by wide, substantially-paved streets, alongside of which rose the warehouses, and within the inner circle of which stood the railway buildings, Commerce Hall, the Sailors' Home, and the garden smiling in all its loveliness. The reader, I trust, has not forgotten these, nor the appearance of the new city above Park avenue; its beautifully-shaded macadamized streets, laid out in regular order; its public buildings, as also the dwellings, standing out open

and free amid ample grounds, grand old trees, beautiful lawns, etc. But further contrast seems needless, as the reader, no doubt, has ere this the picture of each vividly impressed upon the imagination.

In our City of the Future we shall have art commingled with nature, not only constituting a scene magnificent to behold, but tending to secure to the dwellers therein that exuberance of life, health, and joy of which nature is the most efficient promoter.

Poised over New York to-day, the observer beholds but one object which may really be called beautiful, or upon which the eye may long rest with satisfaction and delight, and that is Central Park. There are a few bright little spots to be seen in the city, but so insignificant are they, among the towering masses that surround them, as to be almost indiscernible in a general view from above. It is the Park that is the chief attraction of the New York of to-day, and there thousands wend their way daily to breathe the fresh air, gaze upon its beauties, and strive to drive away for a time that care and anxiety which continually beset them amid the strife and strain of an overtaxed and unnatural life. Thanks to Central Park for this. But it teaches us far more: it tells us of the spontaneous love of man for nature, for the green tree, the field, and the flower. Debarred of these, life is abnormal and unsatisfactory. It is strong testimony, therefore, against the normal existence of great, overcrowded cities, that in them, by the very nature of things, these privileges can be enjoyed, except in a very limited way, only by the favored few.

Now, as we look down upon our great city wherein dwell a million human beings (with another million almost within a stone's throw); some few of whom are living in elegance and luxury; another class comfortably but not luxuriously; others struggling on overwhelmed with care and anxiety, acquiring little more than a bare existence under an industrial and social organization that saps life from every vein and robs the soul of its longed-for peace; while others still, and not a few either, are eking out a still more miserable existence in destitution, wretchedness, and despair—the questions naturally arise in a thoughtful mind: What is all this for? Why this ponderous mass of inorganic matter piled up in such narrow limits, and why this vast concourse of human beings huddled together like sheep in a corner? Should it be assumed that all this is necessary, in order to transact the legitimate business of a commercial city, then against all such assumptions I take a decided stand.

In the city of the future, described in a previous chapter, the reader must have noticed the entire absence of much the larger portion of that which goes to make up the New York of to-day; and let us go on now to point out, in a more definite manner, much that now exists in our great city which I regard as superfluous, and which may therefore be dispensed with. I shall not stop to present argument or proof in support of my assertions, as these will follow in due order, when I come to treat of the different subjects specifically.

I will commence, then, by asking, Of what advantage to commerce are the thousands of factories,

machine-shops, breweries, bone-boiling establishments, and an indefinite number of other nuisances that now encumber the ground and serve to vastly swell the population of the already overcrowded city of New York, as well as of all the other large commercial cities of our republic? I assert without qualification that the legitimate requirements of commerce do not call for any of these, and that therefore they are quite out of place in a commercial city. There is plenty of room for them outside of a commercial city, but not within it, and hence outside is where they belong. The exclusion of these manufactories rids us of a large proportion of the swarm of human beings that congregate in a great city. There is much more, however, that we shall be compelled to dispense with before our model city can arise.

Founding our New Republic on the broad principles of universal brotherhood and equal rights, we must have free trade the world over, and shall have no further need for custom-houses or bonded warehouses. These may be dispensed with, as well as the vast retinue of government officials and employees now in this service. Our new system of finance, hereafter to be given, does away also with all banking-houses and brokers' offices; in fact, nearly all of Wall street may be wiped out, and along with that will fall many costly edifices outside its precincts, which, through the workings of the present complicated, imbecile financial system, sustain the dignity and swell the pockets of our great appropriators. We give a sigh of relief as we clear away all the paraphernalia connected with this old intricate, crazy,

filching system of finance—with its millions of outlay in costly structures, its army of officials, bookkeepers, clerks, and attendants of every sort. As they have no place in our new city, we brush them away as unceremoniously as we would brush the spider, with his web and victims, from the wall. That very respectable gambling-house called the Stock Exchange we can also dispense with; neither do we find any further use for the Produce Exchange; and as we are to have a much less complicated, though more efficient, system of insurance in our New Republic, the life, health, and fire insurance companies (with the many costly structures they have seen fit to erect in order that an imposing and lofty air might be imparted to their vocations), together with their long train of attendants, may step down and out. Neither shall we have any necessity for court buildings and prisons, with their necessary appendages of judges, juries, clerks, sheriffs, and hangers-on in general; nor for the almost innumerable crowd of lawyers, whose offices now occupy so much space in our city.

Upon learning that there are to be no lawyers there, who will doubt that peace and prosperity are to reign in our New Republic?

Then, again, we shall have no place in our model city for the almost numberless little petty stores which we now find crowding each other in our main avenues and streets; which require for their outfit, not only a superabundance of wares, but a vast host of proprietors and attendants, and which must be maintained by plucking one another and the public in general. But, more than all this, our new sys-

tem, substituting collective for individual property interests, does away without effort with those numerous sinks of pollution, the nefarious grog-shops, which are now the curse and the abomination, not only of our own city, but of every city and hamlet in the land.

Again, by the depletion of all this crowd of parasites, and also by the construction of our dwellings for the accommodation of the many, instead of the few, our New City will require but a small number of dwellings compared to the thousands we find huddled together in our city of to-day.

The economical advantages gained in this matter of dwellings alone, by substituting the community-home for that of the isolated individual domicile, is almost beyond estimation. Yet this is but one of its many advantages; and, as I hope to demonstrate hereafter, the benefit thus derived will be but small indeed compared with the increased comforts and the ten thousand blessings which community-life can, in my judgment, alone secure.

As I have already intimated, I regard the many and costly church edifices which now abound in our city as not only unnecessary, but detrimental to the general good; and my reasons for arriving at this conclusion will be given in a subsequent chapter.

Did I wish to be minute, there are many other excrescences, or worse than useless appendages, that might be pointed out in existing New York; but I have now carried the examination far enough, I think, to make it clear that the greater portion of that which goes to make up the *ensemble* of our larger cities is wholly unnecessary to their legitimate wants and re-

quirements. I hold, therefore, that such great cities as we now have upon the face of the globe are uncalled for, and that the crowding together in limited space of such immense masses of human beings is absolutely wicked. Huddled together in these huge pest-houses, deprived of a thousand comforts which might otherwise be enjoyed, men and women lead lives that are unnatural and subversive of health and longevity, and, consequently, of peace, joy, and happiness. But I shall present these matters more fully as we proceed, in speaking of the inner life and workings of our New Republic.

Having briefly contrasted the external aspect of the New York of the present with the metamorphosed New York of the future, we will now glance, still more briefly, at the present external appearance of the great North American continent; contrasting it, as may seem fit, with the republic as it is to be.

To present the contrast the more systematically and clearly, let us pass on, as in my vision, from New York to Long Island, and, while bearing in mind the transformed island as I have pictured it in a previous chapter, let us now note the general characteristics which here present themselves to the eye.

Across the East River, opposite New York, we discover, in place of the green fields, orchards, and gardens seen in my vision, naught but a repetition of those long rows of brick and mortar, iron and stone, which we saw in New York. These are placed here, it might no doubt be claimed, for the convenience and benefit of those who are assisting to transact the commercial business of the great city, but all of them, as we have already seen, would have no call for existence if New

York were properly organized and constructed for a commercial city. "Order," it is said, "is heaven's first law," but he who is but slightly conversant with the arrangement of the universe, and with the order and regularity of the movements of the celestial bodies, will not fail to discover that man has as yet profited but little by the example of the Great Architect. This certainly holds true to a most remarkable degree as regards the establishment of our industrial organization for the adaptation of our planet to be a fitting abode for man. Look where we will, this same lack of a well-devised and well-matured system of united effort, and this same thoughtless, reckless, cut-and-try principle of every man for himself only, is plainly visible.

Looking down upon Long Island to-day, in place of our substantial double-track railway of the future, with all its equipments of the first order, there may be seen, in the sand, on which timbers and iron rails have been laid, a number of very crooked tracks, which are dignified by the name of railways. Some of these railways run parallel with each other and but a few miles apart; others twist and wind about in every conceivable direction that may be necessary to reach some little village, which, like Brooklyn and many other places contiguous to New York, are but parasites living upon her bounty, and which, under a proper system, would have no legitimate excuse for existence; and hence, under a proper ordering of things, there would be no call for most of the railways that lead to them.

Then the appointments of these railways are quite in keeping with the roads themselves—station houses

ill-constructed, filthy, and comfortless, and rolling-stock inadequate, dirty, and dilapidated. And in the place of our future system of elegantly constructed and well-shaded highways, spanning the whole island in regular order, and on which the eye could never fail to rest with delight, what have we now before us?

Rest assured I feel no slight degree of humiliation, as I now attempt, at the close of the nineteenth century, to describe the highways of what may be called a very old-settled portion of energetic, self-glorious America; but as it seems to come within my province, I must not hesitate.

You who have never gazed upon the like, imagine a strip of white sand, the width of an ordinary vehicle, with a cavity sunk at either edge from two to six inches in depth, caused by the wheels of the vehicles as they are drawn along with great effort by panting and smoking quadrupeds, which at every step sink above the fetlocks in this soft earth. Imagine, now, one of these sand-paths winding, in its course, toward every conceivable point of the compass—now this way, to reach an individual who has thought it proper to rear his tenement upon a hill; now that way, to accommodate another who has pitched his tent in the valley; then picking its way around this man's mill-pond to take in the blacksmith shop of another; and so twisting, and curving, and winding about like the tail of a serpent; now over rickety bridges, where life and limb of both man and beast are at stake; and again where much cringing and dodging is necessary to escape the bushes that overhang the sandy path. Imagine hundreds of these brute-killing sand-trails

running without any sort of regularity, and with no purpose further than to reach every man's front door, whatever the circuit necessary, and you have a tolerably fair conception of the system of public highways now included in a bird's-eye view of Long Island, and may form some adequate idea of the public highway of to-day in what is often called the garden-spot of America.

It is true some attempts to improve these sand-trails have been made, and in some cases with fair results; but, as a rule, the public highways of Long Island, and, for that matter, of America at large, are but a grade above the native Indian trail, or cow-path, in which they apparently originated.

Now, from the highways turn the eye upon the fences beside them, and as a rule you will find them anything but pleasing to the eye. These tumble-down, dilapidated apologies for fences make a sorry appearance indeed, when contrasted in the mind with the beautiful hedge I have described as beheld in my vision along these Long Island highways.

The reader will no doubt remember distinctly the community-clusters of the Long Island of our Future Republic, situated at distances of three miles apart, laid out in regular order, buildings all spacious, commodious and elegant, nestling beneath the shade of trees, and looking out upon beautiful lawns and smiling gardens of fruit and flower.

Let us now see what the Long Island of to-day presents in lieu of this. We observe, it is true, many small villages which collectively may present a view from aloft somewhat pleasing, but the pleasure thus

derived is dispelled upon a closer scrutiny. The same marks of caste which we see in the cities are here visible in the habitations, and are often more conspicuous. Some of the buildings, with their environment, are elegant, others passable, while others still are of the most dilapidated and wretched description. Then, even in the villages the same disorder and irregularity are visible that we see in our New York of to-day. The streets are laid out with slight regard to method, and in the main little attempt is made to join art with nature in beautifying and adorning. But what is really of more importance than all else is the fact, already mentioned, that, under a well-ordered commercial organization, many of these villages—perhaps I might say most—would have no legitimate call for existence.

Leaving the villages, the eye rests here and there upon the heterogeneous results of man's constructive sagacity common to all so-called "improved" agricultural districts, upon the plan of isolated individual occupancy. Scattered family abodes, with their accompanying out-buildings, in almost endless variety of architecture, dot the landscape, and form a motley scene. Some of these farm-houses, comparatively speaking, may be called beautiful, but by far the larger portion present little of beauty, or even of neatness and thrift. The buildings are usually in a dilapidated condition, and need to be repaired and painted, or, what would be a greater improvement, to be torn down to give place to better. Heaps of rubbish litter the ground; door-yard fences are down, gates are off their hinges, and the pig-pen is often but a few yards from the kitchen

door; while barn-yard and stables are but little further removed.

This, we all know, is quite a correct picture of the individual family homes, over the beauties of which political demagogues are wont to rave so much. The general appearance of the buildings, and the outlook about the individual farm-houses, are quite indicative, in the main, of the rudimentary manner in which the attempt to cultivate and adorn the earth, and to make it subservient to man's wants, is carried on, not only on Long Island, but over the whole North American continent. The general appearance of our entire country is ample proof of this. Nearly every farmer has double, treble, quadruple, or perhaps ten, twenty, or fifty times the quantity of land that he can cultivate with any degree of thoroughness, and the consequence is that there is produced from the land but a mere fraction of what it is capable of producing. Yet on every portion of our planet's surface, human beings are huddled together in cities, where they famish for want of that sustenance which nature would so amply provide if mankind would but organize an industrial system befitting the wants of the age.

I have dwelt somewhat at length upon the appearance of Long Island, for the reason that the general features which mark that locality are characteristic, in a great measure, of the whole country. In the further pursuance, therefore, of my design of calling the attention of the reader to the present general appearance of the continent, in order that he may contrast the same with the general appearance as beheld in my vision, I shall be much less minute

than heretofore. I shall take but a rapid, sweeping glance over the continent, noting only the more prominent characteristics, while I shall make such comments upon the existing order of things as may seem to me timely and appropriate.

My plan of pursuing this investigation for the purpose of pointing out the defects in our Industrial System (using this term in its broadest signification), I am aware, exposes me to the criticism that in treating of this, as of all other questions, both sides are entitled to a hearing; and that consequently, to be fair, the advantages arising from the present order of things should be stated, as well as the defects. To this I would reply that of course no one will deny that our present industrial system (if it be admitted that we have anything which may be properly styled an industrial system) has been advanced far beyond the rude attempts at the improvement and cultivation of the earth made by the savage tribes. But my claim is that our industrial system is by no means commensurate with the intelligence nor adequate to the requirements of our age, and is therefore hardly deserving of commendation.

In so far as any system falls short of reaching to man's ideal, when that ideal is unquestionably based upon human possibilities, that system is defective; and it is through pointing out the defects of a system that we place it in a position for being either improved or abolished, so that a better may be reared in its place. Industrial Systems, like religions which may have been in some manner suited to the age in which they originated, but have passed

their day of usefulness, should be supplanted by those better adapted to the intellect and advancement of the times.

We will now proceed to a further consideration of the defects of an industrial system which, having passed the zenith of its usefulness (providing it ever had much usefulness), should, and will ere long, be supplanted by a superior system, and one which is more in harmony with the advanced condition of the race.

Passing on from Long Island over New England, we look down upon a scene different indeed in many of its aspects from the one we have left behind, but still marked by most of those prominent characteristics which denote an industrial system fragmentary, unskilful, and unprogressive. We find the usual excess in the number of cities, and more than the usual excess of large manufacturing towns and villages. It is not denied that some portions of New England are better adapted to manufacturing than to agricultural pursuits; but this is no good reason for establishing or retaining there any sort of manufacture which might be prosecuted to better advantage somewhere else. What good reasons are there, for instance, why cotton from the South should be transported to New England for manufacture into cloths, and these cloths carried back for distribution among the Southern people, while all the natural facilities for the manufacture of this cotton into cloths are to be found in the vicinity in which it is raised?

There is something radically wrong, certainly, in a method which calls for all this unnecessary transportation and waste of labor. It is evident, upon

common-sense business principles, that quite a large share of the manufacture of New England has no legitimate place there. A large portion of her varied manufactures, under a better regulated industrial system, would be connected with agricultural pursuits, and distributed all over the land, as we have seen was the case in the New Republic.

It is clear that in passing over New England, besides the many defects already depicted in our description of Long Island, we look down upon a vast number of large towns and villages that are but the abnormal growth of an ill-devised manufacturing system; as also upon a scene denoting in agricultural pursuits, and in the general improvement and advancement of the soil, a lack of system similar to that which stares one in the face throughout the wide expanse of our entire continent. We see scores of half-built railways winding their tortuous course along, to bring up at some manufacturing town that has no legitimate call for existence; we see a hotch-potch of highways that are a disgrace to the people of any portion of a land that has had fifty years of existence, and that calls itself civilized; we see the same system of school-boy farming we have called the reader's attention to on Long Island, while everywhere prevails the same lack of neatness, order, and beauty, and a general neglect of adapting means to an end, and that end the mutual welfare of mankind.

Passing on westward, as we are about to leave Massachusetts and enter the state of New York, the eye fixes itself upon an anomaly so strange, and yet so pertinent to the subject of which we are treating, that it must not be passed without notice.

Here may be seen two villages in marked contrast with those surrounding them. The buildings are spacious and commodious; there are no squalid huts like those which we have seen in every village we have heretofore looked down upon; the barns are upon a huge scale; all the buildings glow with the freshest coats of paint—neatness, order, comfort and thrift abound throughout. The fields that surround these villages bear the marks of unexampled neatness, order, and prosperity; fences are superior; bushes and briars have been cleared away; meadows drained; stumps have been extracted and burned; stones dug up and put into fences, and the surface of the land made smooth and ready everywhere for the reaper and the mowing-machine. In short, everything about these villages and the fields belonging to them is in singular contrast to the adjacent farms and villages. The pastures are fresher; the grass and grain grow more luxuriantly; the orchards yield more luscious fruit; the horses, cattle, and sheep are better bred; and the products of the field and factory are of acknowledged superiority, and bring the highest prices in the market.

Strange as it may appear, these are community-villages in which property is held in common—the quintessence of folly and abomination to the present age! And, what may also be considered strange, these communities have attained their present state of prosperity under the most adverse circumstances. They have been hampered from within by the unnatural practice of celibacy imposed upon them, while from without they have been conspicuous objects of ridicule and contempt.

I regard the rearing of these Shaker communities, amid surroundings so antagonistic, to a height of material prosperity far surpassing the results of all the individual effort around them, much as I would regard the raising, from the germ, of some tropical plant, upon soil not the most favorable, exposed to the cold blasts of our northern climate, and still deep-rooted, vigorous, and putting forth its blossoms in due season in wonderful exuberance. The natural tenacity of life exhibited in such a plant would be typical of these communities that have encountered obstacles the most serious, and yet have progressed in material prosperity, if nothing more, far beyond those who have been their competitors in the struggle for existence.

I am not defending Shakerism, for with its cast-iron, unnatural bond of celibacy I have as little patience as I have sympathy with many other of its tenets and forms. I am bringing forward these Shaker communities for the purpose of illustrating the advantages in material comforts of *combined* as against *individual* effort; and no further demonstration of this great fact, it seems to me, can be asked for. In social matters, I have no less faith in the superiority of communal over isolated family life, but I shall not look to Shakerism for an illustration of this, though I hope to demonstrate it beyond doubt in this work; and should I not do so, the fault will be my own, and no one should conclude therefrom that such demonstration is impossible.

Neither must it be understood that I regard these Shaker villages as models, by any means, in external appearances. The favorable aspect in which they

appear comes from taking as a standard of comparison their present environment; but when contrasted with the community-villages of the future, as presented in a former chapter, they sink into the commonplace, with little of comparative order, taste, or beauty.

As we pass on a little further westward, we come upon a community that deserves notice from the fact that, while founded and reared under conditions, in one essential particular at least, quite opposite to Shakerism, it has attained a similar degree of prosperity.

Here we find, or have found until recently, a system of complex marriage, or free love, as it is sometimes called, which, while maintained, drew down upon the heads of this singularly independent and courageous people hatred, contempt, and a shower of denunciation even greater than that which has fallen to the lot of Shakerism. Yet, surmounting all antagonisms and difficulties, they too, in turn, have reached a state of material prosperity much superior to that of their individual competitors. So we see that neither the odium of celibacy nor of free love proved sufficient to prevent the industrial success of these communities; and if celibacy and free love, the most unpopular doctrines that could possibly be advocated at the present day (except it be Communism), could not blast the prosperity of a community, it is hard to conceive what could.

I am aware that by some the objection is urged that it is impossible for associations of individuals to dwell together, except in communities which, like those mentioned, are bound by some religious senti-

ment sufficiently potential to weave their lives into harmony. I do not object to this in the abstract, but when it is asserted that a belief in some dogmatic theological creed of man's invention is indispensable, then I do object most emphatically.

Community-life, wherein the interests and welfare of each are the interest and welfare of all, is in its very essence of an exalted spiritual nature, and the rise into such a state from the selfish individualism of existing society must needs be gradual; but we are advancing toward this high ideal at greater speed than we apprehend, and shall advance still more rapidly as we near the goal.

Such illustrations as those afforded by the Shaker and Oneida communities, and others which will be hereafter mentioned in this work, demonstrate to a certainty, it appears to me, that at least the *material* prosperity of mankind in the aggregate will be greatly augmented by a universal community system, in which property shall be held in common. In these communities they have no poor, with the concomitants of anxiety, destitution, want, and despair. Comfort—even abundance, in a material point of view—is insured to all.

Leaving the state of New York, which, in the light we are now viewing it under, presents general characteristics not unlike those of New England, and passing on to the great valley of the Mississippi—the extent and possibilities of which have already been noticed—what do we there behold? I hear some enthusiastic admirer of that region answer: "The cotton-growing district, and the granary of the world."

There is a degree of truth in this; but it would have been still more complete and less sensational had the speaker added, "in embryo."

I am not oblivious to the fact that this great basin of the Mississippi has contributed, and is still contributing, a large surplus production to supply the wants of many people, both in our own and in foreign lands; but of far greater importance, to my mind, is the question what this wide extent of territory, favored so highly by nature, is producing, and what it is capable of being made to produce.

It is by comparison that we justly measure progress, and this comparison may be fitly made, not only with the real, but with the ideal also, providing the attainment of that ideal does not transcend the possibilities of human achievement.

If we compare the present appearance of this great tract of country with its appearance, say a century ago, the progress seems great indeed, and we are inclined to glory in its present condition; but contrast the reality with the picture presented in my vision and given the reader in a former chapter, and the present advantages sink into insignificance. We then behold it as it really is—that is, in an extremely rudimentary condition, so far as its improvements fit it to the wants of civilized man.

This great valley of the Mississippi, covering a large portion of our continent, and most admirably adapted by nature for being laid out and improved upon scientific principles, presents to the eye of the lover of order and system to-day a picture that is melancholy in the extreme. Speaking generally, there is hardly the faintest resemblance to anything

pertaining to system or wisdom, either in public improvements or in the attempts to cultivate and adorn the earth. On the contrary, there is much to remind one of the enormous and reckless waste and sacrifice of man's energies and labor through the lack of well-devised system and united effort.

Turning now to the north, we come upon a vast extent of territory (the present British America), a great portion of which remains totally unreclaimed. Covered by primeval forests, and watered by beautiful rivers and lakes, are thousands of square miles of arable lands which need but the hand of man, guided by such intelligence as shall secure some well-matured scientific plan of action, to transform them into a region of plenty and of beauty. The climate of a great portion of this area is not, as is often supposed, too severely cold for successful agriculture, and it is not to be doubted that cultivation would modify the temperature to a considerable extent, rendering British America in this respect, as in most others, a pleasant land in which to dwell.

Of the general appearance of that vast extent of our continent lying between the great valley of the Mississipi and the arable lands on the Pacific coast there is little more to say than has been said in a former chapter. Except in a very limited manner, no attempt has ever yet been made to reclaim those vast lands, which cover a territory embracing nearly one-third of the United States. It is true that a large portion of this territory, by reason of its mountainous and irregular surface, or its too rigorous climate, is beyond the reach of cultivation; but the major part is quite susceptible of improvement, and might be

made to produce abundantly. It is true, also, that there still are broad fields of uncultivated and half-cultivated lands in the valley of the Mississippi which will, naturally, be brought under improvement before much will be done toward reclaiming the less eligible lands of the far West; but were the labor now daily sacrificed there in extracting metals from the earth for an almost useless purpose expended in irrigating and reclaiming the fields adjacent to these mining districts, it is almost impossible to estimate the benefit that would thereby accrue to mankind.

We will now pass on to that beautiful tract of country lying between the Sierras and the Pacific; and if ever a portion of the country was especially favored by nature, I think it is this. Her natural exuberance of production arising from climate and soil is indeed wonderful. Vegetation indigenous to both the temperate and tropical zones flourishes here profusely. Her flowers are the fairest, and her fruits the most delicious, of the whole land. Limited as is this section in extent, yet millions of human beings might here sit beneath the shade of their own vine and fig-tree, enjoying the many blessings of this highly-favored land. Such it might be; but how different from this it is! Instead of the millions who ought each to hold an interest in the soil of this beautiful country, a score or so of individuals have gobbled up the greater portion of it, and retain it for their own personal benefits.

Unhappy Ireland bears witness to what will be the fate of humanity throughout our whole land, as in all other lands, unless some radical change is made in the property system of the world. And

who is it, reader, that gives to these landed gentry the privilege of supreme control over these vast acres of nature's domain? It is society, of which you and I each form a part; and unless we raise our voices firmly and defiantly against such injustice; unless we do all in our power to right such wrongs, boldly denouncing a public sentiment that upholds or tacitly assents to them, we make ourselves participants in this injustice, and share in its wickedness.

We have now passed a rapid glance over the continent, and the reader has no doubt been somewhat impressed with the disadvantages arising from the ruling *penchant* of every man for paddling his own canoe, regardless of his fellow.

I have run over the matter hastily and sweepingly, assuming that the reader has already a very comprehensive idea of the general appearance of the existing order of things throughout our land. To form, I think, quite an intelligent opinion as to what hotch-potch, isolated efforts upon the selfish, individual plan have produced in the world, he needs but to contrast this, as touched upon in the current chapter, and much else apparent to his own observation and intelligence, with the picture of the New Republic as witnessed in my vision, and given in a former chapter. Through such comparison the effect of our rudimentary, school-boy industrial system is brought out in bold relief. Our system of internal improvements (provided it be granted that we have any such system) sinks into the commonplace, and our individual attempts toward cultivating and adorning the earth seem puerile enough. Contem-

plating these matters, we lose not a little of our turkey-gobbler assurance; our breasts cease to expand with pride; our plumage droops, and our strut is visibly modified. A suspicion begins to dawn upon our minds that something more than this is required to subdue the earth and adapt it to the wants and happiness of mankind. We begin to suspect, perhaps, that it might have been better had mankind long ago fixed upon some definite, well-devised, and well-matured plan of action by which their labors could have been prosecuted in a more intelligent and harmonious way.

Suppose that a thousand men were desirous of reaching Liverpool; suppose there were no vessels to convey them, and that then, instead of uniting their efforts, building a ship, and going together, each should build a canoe for himself and undertake to paddle himself across. This would be precisely analogous, as I view it, to the present plan of each striving to make his own way in the world regardless, in a great measure, of the rest. Nine-tenths of those who should thus set out to cross the ocean in their individual canoes would be likely to come to grief. And so, by their independent course, an equal portion fail of their purpose in the pursuit of the comforts and joys of life. Only a few, possessed of the indispensable requisites of the sailor, and much favored, besides, by wind and wave, would ever get across; and it is only the few so favored who reap success in buffeting the billows of life. Thus far, in the world, instead of some definite plan of action having been devised, upon which mankind might work together in harmony for one common

end, and that end the mutual welfare and happiness of all, each individual has gone on working, in the main, after a plan of his own. The result is what we see—a muddle, confusion, and a want of general success, that is humiliating to man's intelligence, and stamps society as much more barbarous, as yet, than civilized.

Thus far, no doubt, the capacity of the earth to provide for the wants of its people has caused much indifference to the industrial problem. This, however, cannot much longer continue without visiting upon mankind the most serious consequences. The population has already advanced to such a degree that, if human life is to be maintained in comfort upon the earth, the great question should be thoughtfully considered, of how our globe may best be fitted and prepared to maintain the immense concourse of people that will eventually gather upon her surface, and how some scheme may be formulated and fixed upon through which mankind may be organized for working together to meet the requirements of the times. In fact, the exigencies of the case demand that we not only move, but that we move quickly, if we would relieve our fellow-beings from the burdens which already press sorely upon them, and which are likely to increase at a frightful rate while matters remain as they are. Millions upon millions of human beings who, in our great cities, towns, and villages, are engaged in commercial and manufacturing pursuits, and who are eking out a more or less miserable existence, should be scattered over the great valley of the Mississippi and other portions of the land, cultivating and em-

bellishing the earth, or employed at such manufacture as a well-devised system and an intelligent direction should point out. That our industrial system should not have advanced beyond the most infantile, inchoate stage seems wonderful when the immense consequences of the fact are considered.

It would seem that among the first concerns of mankind, upon arriving at a social state of some importance, would have been the adoption of some intelligent method of forcing the earth to yield to his wants its greatest abundance; and that, as he rose higher in the scale of being, a taste for the beautiful would also have arisen in his soul; hence it would be inferred that some systematic plan would have been devised and adopted for the embellishment of the earth. These, I say, would seem to be the natural suppositions; but as we find, even now, so little of united effort toward industrial organization for these purposes, we are led to conclude either that mankind are naturally averse to organization and co-operation to accomplish their desires, or that they have never as yet become aroused to the inestimable advantages to be attained through these methods. The first of these suppositions is rendered untenable from the fact that huge organizations have already, and long ago, been formed by mankind both for war and politics. The extent to which organization has been employed in these fields demonstrates the wonderful power of united action when the necessities of the case are overpoweringly thrust upon the minds of men. We are left, therefore, to the other conclusion, which is that mankind have not as yet become aroused to the

importance of the benefits which may be derived from organized and united effort in subduing, cultivating, and embellishing the earth.

Thus far we have ever been making abortive attempts to accomplish a purpose and to reach an end, and that purpose and that end the highest happiness of each and all upon the earth ; and the method has been for everyone to strike out and pursue recklessly and blindly his own course, almost regardless of the rest. I do not believe the desired end can ever be reached through this selfish method. It is the barbarous method, as I have before said, and the closer we continue to adhere to it the nearer allied to barbarism shall we remain. An industrial system that will secure united and harmonious effort among mankind is what is now needed more than all else for the attainment of the highest order of civilization and the greatest happiness of mankind upon the earth.

CHAPTER V.

GOVERNMENT AND LAWS.

At the close of my third night's experience, having now traversed and examined nearly the entire surface of the continent, I again began to have doubts both of the further continuance of my vision and of the reappearance of my venerable guide.

I had hardly closed my eyes on the fourth night, however, before my honored attendant stood by my side, and we were once more hovering over the city of my home.

"You have been permitted an aerial view of the Future Republic," he said, "and now I am to show you its people, their government, their customs, and their mode of life. In your own republic," he continued, "which now comprises the entire North American continent, may be found a true type of the life, customs, and government of each of the other great divisions of the globe. You will be permitted, as before, to change with the velocity of thought from one portion of the Republic to another, so that, by personal examination, everything may be shown and made clear to you.

"As the happiness of a people," he concluded, "depends largely upon their mode of government, I will now point out to you the governmental system that has been established in the Republic."

Instantly I was transferred to St. Louis, and there beheld the Capitol of the Great Republic. It was a granite building, four stories in height, and in external appearance resembled Science Hall in New York, though quite different in its internal construction.

As this matter will come up again, I shall not stop here to note the different purposes to which this building was assigned, but shall mention only what is *apropos* to my present purpose.

This Capitol contained a large hall for the use of the Chief Magistrates when gathered together for deliberation, discussion, and decision upon all matters pertaining to the public interests that properly came under their jurisdiction. The duties of the chief magistrates may be defined as the devising and putting into execution of plans for all works of a public nature, or, in other words, the supervising and regulating of such public matters as did not properly belong to the communities themselves.

It was not a function of the chief magistrates, let it be here understood, to make laws (as prescribed statute laws there were none), but substantially, as before stated—varying the language in order to make the matter more clear—their duties were to decide all public questions which might properly be brought before them, to devise plans for the proper ordering of the public interests, and to direct as to their execution. The decisions of the chief magistrates were final in all public matters, and were carried out undeviatingly. The doors of the House of Magistrates were never closed; its members, except for short intervals of rest, taken alternately, remained at their post continually for four hours each day.

I will now state how the officers of this our New Republic, were chosen.

It is necessary to premise, however, that throughout the length and breadth of the New Republic the people all lived in communities varying in size from one hundred to three hundred individuals. Each and every community had its chief ruler, called "the Magistrate," who was chosen annually by the community-members, and for whom every individual of eighteen years and upward, of either sex, had the privilege of voting.

The chief magistrates, as those elected to the house of magistrates at St. Louis were called, and who were always one hundred in number, exclusive of the chairman, were chosen by the community magistrates, and for this purpose the Republic was divided into one hundred and one districts.

Every chief magistrate was selected from among the community magistrates in his own district, each community magistrate being entitled to a vote in the election.

The term for which the chief magistrates were chosen was five years, but they might be re-elected and returned, as might also the community magistrates. The chief magistrates chose from among their number a presiding officer, who was styled the President of the Republic. There was also chosen in every community, at the time and in the manner prescribed for the election of the magistrate, five individuals (who might be of either sex) who acted as counsel for the magistrate, and were termed "the Council." As the arbitrament of the house of magistrates was final in all matters of a more public

character, so the rulings of the Council were supreme in all community affairs. The duties of the magistrate were executive, principally, and for any flagrant act of injustice or tyranny he might at any time be deposed. A charge for deposing the magistrate had to proceed from the council, and to be made effective required a majority vote of the community. A rule, strictly adhered to by all the communities, was the ineligibility to office for five years thereafter of any individual who should be convicted of attempting, in any manner whatever, either directly or indirectly, to influence his or her election. A charge of this kind brought before the council was required to be substantiated by at least three individuals, who had heard the accused advocate his or her own election, or who could testify to any attempt to solicit votes for that purpose.

Besides the officers enumerated, a Magistrate and a Council of Five were also chosen for each city, and called the "City Magistrates" and the "City Council." These officers were chosen by the Community Magistrates in the several cities for the term of one year. Their duties were to direct and decide in all matters pertaining to the general interests in which the several communities of the city were mutually involved.

This, in the main, was all the machinery used or found necessary for conducting the affairs of government in the New Republic. As there were no laws, no penalties were required for the breaking of laws. Only one penalty was ever imposed upon a human being, and that was *expulsion from the community.* But such expulsion might become a serious matter

indeed. The outcast, upon being expelled from a community, was given a paper showing that it was his first expulsion, and what had been the offense. With this, but not without it, he might gain admission into another community for a new trial. If he again refused to conduct himself properly, and to submit to the rules of the community, he was again expelled, bearing a document showing that it was his second expulsion; also what were his first and second offenses. This would secure him, for the third and last time, entrance into a community. If his conduct was now such that he could no longer be borne with, he was again driven out, and this time to become an outcast from his race—to herd evermore with the wild beast. Instances of this, however, were very rarely known. There being no motive for crime, crime was almost unknown in the land; for where justice reigns, mankind, as a rule, cheerfully perform their duties.

And now, reader, here, within the limits of a few pages, I have sketched for you the basic system of a government under which a great people lived in peace, prosperity, and happiness. It may be enough to excite to derision and to convulse with laughter the egotistical politician and law-maker of our own day, but I would ask that the reader suspend judgment until he has read what further the writer has to say in this work, and until he has pondered upon the subject a sufficient length of time to be fairly entitled to an opinion.

The wisest and best government that can ever be devised for man's guidance, and one under which he may dwell in peace and harmony with his kind, is

that which shall extend to him the widest individual liberty compatible with public order. It is evident that mankind cannot dwell harmoniously together in a state of anarchical confusion. There must be organization, system, in government as in all things wherein men join their forces for their mutual benefit. But while order is an essential element in society, and organization for securing and maintaining this is indispensable, in my belief, under just, equitable, and proper industrial and property systems, this may be reached and maintained without laws. The enactment of laws to restrain mankind from wrong acts and preserve public order is the attempt to carry out the barbarous and, I may say, too, the theological theory that mankind can be governed by *force.*

In some despotic god, like the Hebrew Jehovah, ruling mankind with an iron hand, with kings and priests as his vicegerents upon the earth, and to whom was delegated his despotic sway, originated primarily the idea of a ruler of mankind, which is the one dominant idea that still exists. With this idea I, for one, have no sympathy. I believe there is a better way to rule mankind, and this better way is by *persuasion.* First establish just systems, then treat all men and women as human beings, human brothers and sisters, and you will find no further use for a code of laws.

The simple organization or system which I have here marked out embraces, in my belief, all the principal essentials to the preservation of public order, while it affords, moreover, to the individual, the fullest liberty compatible with this. It makes government *advisory* rather than *compulsory;* selects,

as a matter of course, the wisest and best to be the directing minds or leaders, leaving the people to their choice to accept society, with all its comforts and joys, or to become outcasts from it and cast their lot with the wild beasts.

It must be understood that the time referred to here, in which we find a condition of society rendering practicable the system of government which I have described, is supposed to be in the remote future—a time in which the ruling power of society has at last become wholly vested in its proper repository—the *moral sentiment.*

Think of it now, my fellow-men; get right down to the very core of the matter, and see if your better judgment does not tell you that the only true instrumentality through which man may be guided in his association with his fellows is the moral sentiment.

When mankind learn to heed and obey this, they will have no further need for laws; and such was the condition of society in the Republic of which I now speak. The moral sentiment is the true monitor, mandator, and arbiter of mankind in their associations; its true exponent is public opinion, and public opinion is the properly constituted public authority. There is little room for doubt that public opinion would be all-potent for the harmonious government of mankind if the system of private property were out of the way; but while this system is retained, no government or laws within the power of man to devise can ever promote harmony or restrain men from wronging their kind. Were we to examine the matter closely, we should find, I think, that even under existing society public opinion is a

far more potent check upon man's propensity to wrong his fellow than all the multifarious laws that have ever been invented.

The man or woman who has passed beyond the restraining influences of public opinion (if such a person is to be found) has struck a level with the brute, and feels about as much respect for human laws as does the brute. But I doubt if a human being can be discovered wholly insensible to public opinion. The nearer men approximate to this brutish condition, however, the less repugnance they have to committing acts which the laws forbid. Many observe the laws, not that they have much regard for them or for their penalties, but that they are disgraced by breaking them.

If there were no other power than that of the laws for restraining mankind in our republic to-day, a sorry time, indeed, we should have of it; but public opinion, exercising a censorship over our actions, is far more potent than all the laws which human wisdom can devise.

I am aware that public opinion is not always *right* opinion, but it will always come just as near to this as the average moral sentiment of a people will permit. Public opinion, as I have before said, is the embodiment and voice of the moral sentiment, and will change, therefore, as the moral sentiment of a people changes. Public opinion is strong, also, in proportion as it plants itself upon equal justice between man and man.

But when public opinion says, "You shall not steal," and then explains, or leaves it to be inferred, that you may not steal *directly*, but in an indirect way—

that is, by deceiving, cheating, or in any manner not prohibited by the law; that you may steal all you can get your hands upon—then public opinion loses its potency. Laws are then required to restrain the indignant—those who feel themselves circumvented and wronged. But let us do away with the system of private property, which breeds such conditions as have been pointed out above, and plant ourselves upon a basis of exact and equal justice to all, and there will be no further ruling power required than that of public opinion.

Public *opinion*, under the *regime* which I have foreshadowed for the Future Republic, becomes public *authority;* and what device for the government of mankind under such conditions could be less onerous or more proper and potent? But, although in this work I predicate my *regime* of public opinion without laws for the government of mankind, upon an improved, a higher and more exalted, general moral sentiment, I am free to declare here, that, taking the general moral sentiment of the people *as it now exists, coupled with a system of collective property,* I would not hesitate to trust my own fate, and that of those nearest me by the ties of blood and affection, to such a system of government as that foreshadowed in this chapter. With all the evil I see around me in the world, I have still an abiding faith in the virtue of my fellow-men, when treated justly. Moreover, when mankind in the savage state have already found it possible to dwell together in peace and happiness under no other law than that prescribed by public opinion, I fail to see why this

state may not also be reached among people calling themselves civilized.

In evidence of the fact that there have already been instances of such rule, I quote here from Wallace's "Malay Archipelago," Vol. II., p. 460–1. "I have lived," says Wallace, "with communities of savages in South America and in the East, who have no laws or law courts but the public opinion of the village freely expressed. Each man scrupulously respects the rights of his fellow, and any infraction of these rights rarely or never takes place.

"In such a community all are nearly equal. There are none of those wide distinctions of education and ignorance, wealth and poverty, master and servant, which are the products of our civilization; there is none of that widespread division of labor which, while it increases wealth, produces also conflicting interests; there is not that severe competition and struggle for existence, or for wealth, which the dense population of civilized countries inevitably creates. All incitement to great crimes is thus wanting, and petty ones are repressed, partly by the influence of public opinion, but chiefly by that natural sense of justice, and of his neighbor's right, which seems to be in some degree inherent in every race of man. Now, although we have progressed vastly beyond the savage state in intellectual achievements, we have not advanced equally in morals. It is true that among those classes who have no wants that cannot be easily supplied, and among whom public opinion has great influence, the rights of others are freely respected. It is true, also, that we have vastly extended the sphere of those rights, and include

within them all the brotherhood of man. But it is not too much to say that the mass of our population have not advanced beyond the savage code of morals, and have in many cases sunk below it."

This argues as badly for the influence of our present civilization upon the morals of a people as it does favorably for public opinion as a ruling power. As, however, the moral question will come up again further on, it is the foregoing evidence given of the restraining power of public opinion to which I would more particularly call the reader's attention.

As further evidence of the salutary power of public opinion, I will here quote a few sentences from one of our most eminent early statesmen. Thomas Jefferson wrote, "I am convinced that those societies [as the Indians] which live without government enjoy in their general mass an infinitely greater degree of happiness than those who live under European governments. Among the former public opinion is in the stead of law, and restrains morals as powerfully as laws ever did anywhere. Among the latter, under pretense of governing, they have divided their nations into two classes—wolves and sheep. I do not exaggerate; this is a true picture of Europe" (Tucker's Life of Jefferson, I., 255).

It being an unquestionable fact that a lax moral sentiment is the legitimate outgrowth of the system of individual property, to speak of the necessity of a more exalted moral sentiment being created before we can expect any very material change in our property system might, at first sight, appear inconsistent; but still another great fact is this (as I shall endeavor to show in a future chapter), that, notwithstanding

the corrupting influences of our existing property system, the moral standard of the people continues steadily to advance.

Not stopping to enlarge further upon these matters, let us now proceed to put our existing system of government under examination, that we may be able to discover, if possible, whether the self-assured politician and legislator who may deride my *ideal* have much of which they may fairly boast in their *real*.

I shall not contend that our system of government is not, perhaps, the best that has ever been established upon the earth (except it be those described by Wallace, where public opinion was the ruling power); and it is not with other existing or past systems of government that I would ask the reader to compare our own, but with an ideal government of the future, to be established when that element which is the chief bone of contention with our own and all prior governments has passed into oblivion. I refer, of course, to the system of individual property, to protect which governments and laws are now and ever have been principally instituted. To compress the matter into a sentence, our republic, in common with all other civilized nations, first incorporated into its system a fundamental principle naturally calculated to make rascals of all its people; and when this Pandora's box of evils has once been opened wide, the government attempts to mitigate the baneful effect by putting into execution a code of arbitrary laws.

Now, granting that our system of government has been as successful as any other in its attempt to

restrain, after letting loose, these evils, experience has already shown, I think, that to overcome them through laws is an utter impossibility.

The only feasible course for effecting a cure is to remove the cause—strangle the mother that gave, and still gives, most of these evils their being. But the reader will perhaps be better prepared to judge of this suggestion after following the writer in his examination of our existing system of government and laws. Broadly speaking, the function of our government really consists in concocting, framing, and putting into execution a code of almost innumerable laws.

I shall first speak of the *modus operandi* for the election of those who are to devise and enact our laws, as well as those who are to execute them. Secondly, I shall call the reader's attention to their execution; and, lastly, to the character of these laws.

At the very threshold of the subject, we are confronted by an injustice of the most flagrant character, and an anomaly not a little remarkable. We pompously claim to have "universal suffrage," when the fact is that (leaving out minors of both sexes) one-half of our adult population have not even so much as the right to vote in the election of the officers who are to make and execute the laws which they are expected to obey. In what way, let me ask, would it be possible for us to heap a greater insult upon the heads of our mothers, wives and daughters? By this action we virtually stamp them as imbeciles, unfit to exercise the prerogative of government along with this wonderful creature, this throat-splitting,

dunghill-crowing, peacock-strutting, turkey-gobbler swelling male superior!

So, with all our boasted rights of liberty and equality, woman is to-day regarded and held under our *model* system of government as the inferior, the political slave, of man. Civilized, as we call ourselves, and living in this "enlightened age," we still put this brutal affront upon our mothers, wives, and daughters.

To be a slave is not necessarily to be bought and sold. To be a slave is to be deprived of liberty—to be domineered over by others. Is not this precisely woman's position while amenable to laws she has no voice in constructing or administering?

This slavery of woman, as also the slavery of man, originated from precisely the same conditions that gave birth to private property. In fact, slavery was, in our republic, until our own generation, a part and portion of this nefarious institution, for both man and woman were held as private property. This custom originated when reason and justice were but little, if at all, considered—when might made right. Whatever was wanted by the stronger to appease his hunger, to add to his pleasures, or to gratify his passions, was taken from the weaker without as much as saying, "By your leave!" With all the light that has now been shed upon the world, that we should go on from age to age retaining the vile wrongs of a barbarous era is one of the eccentricities of human nature for which it is difficult to assign any reasonable cause or excuse. No country is entitled to be called free or civilized while a vestige of this barbarism of human slavery is still retained, whether

its injustice falls upon either man or woman. I would here make the qualifying statement that one reason is obvious why woman has so long been left without a voice either in the making or in the execution of the laws by which she is expected to abide; and that is, that our political hacks and aspirants who virtually control these matters are no doubt actually ashamed to have mother, wife, or daughter know what nefarious scamps they are in conducting the affairs of state, as would be the case were women admitted to the political arena. That such an inference is fairly warrantable I think will become apparent as we proceed.

For the administration of government, the framing, enacting, and execution of all laws pertaining to the country at large, we have in our republic our legislative bodies at Washington. Each state has also similar bodies; and, besides, each important city or borough is privileged to make and enforce its own local ordinances. I shall not stop to particularize further, since our legislative and executive systems are familiar to all. After having left out the women as imbeciles in the machinery of our government, let us look into the methods of their male "superiors" for the election of public officials.

We will commence with the small town or borough. Almost every township has its village, in which may be found those who are the leaders in local politics. If the village is large, there may be several who have lively political aspirations; but it usually happens that one or two excel in the natural qualifications essential to their profession, and who, possessed of some little means or the art of making a living with-

out labor, have the leisure to bestow upon politics the most of their attention. One or two individuals of this stamp soon make themselves the pivot upon which all the political affairs of the township revolve. As the village political "bell-wether" has marked characteristics, and is quite a genius in his way, both the man and his tactics will require a little attention here. The predominating attributes of the fellow's nature are assurance, shrewdness, tact, and discretion, combined with trickery, hypocrisy, and utter selfishness; but his wonderful precaution in a great measure hides these latter characteristics. Too lazy to work, in early life he resolves upon getting his living by his wits, for which purpose his natural shrewdness and tact avail him well; and if an opportunity is presented, he is likely to attach himself to some successful business enterprise in which he will have much to say and little to do. He is plastic—that is to say, he is capable of molding himself into almost any form which occasion may require, and through this quality gains much favor in the eyes of the public. If a strong religious sentiment prevails in the township, he attends the church meetings and talks like a saint; if it be temperance, he is equally loud in proclaiming its virtues—though if it happen to be at a time nearing an election, he is quite likely, as he leaves the temperance meeting, and before directing his steps homeward, to steal into the back door of some low groggery and take a few social drinks with some favorite cronies who will not "blow on him." His manner is not inclined to stiffness, but he is social with all, particularly at the beginning of his career, or upon the eve of an election.

He has some gift for public speaking, and this is greatly assisted by his wonderful egotism and self-poise. He grants favors at times, apparently in the most unselfish manner, but, rest assured, he expects to have both principal and interest back at enormous rates of increase. Friendship, uninfluenced by self-interest, he has no knowledge of; neither is there such a thing as a sense of gratitude in his composition, his inherent selfishness making him oblivious to all favors of a generous nature.

This bell-wether of politics is, in short, a whited sepulcher, a consummate villain at heart, but with such admirable tact that he passes currently as respectable. Through the coterie which he draws around him, he secures and maintains the popular favor, and for a time—often for a succession of years—he rules his little township with a sway almost as despotic as that of the Czar of Russia. To secure this influence and power, organization is of course necessary, and at the commencement of his career one of the first things our political autocrat does is to hedge himself about with a cabinet of congenial spirits. In the selection of his cabinet, gifted as he is with great discernment, he seldom makes a mistake, but succeeds in surrounding himself with those who will lend influence and popularity to his administration, and at the same time will be molded and fashioned to his own will. If a lawyer of the right stamp can be found—which is not usually difficult—he prefers to select from this profession his chief of staff. The individual who allows himself to be drawn into our political autocrat's proposed ring is likely, of course, to be endowed with many characteristics

similar to those of his master, and yet, it is probable, will be unlike him in many respects. As we always have two prominent parties in the field, it is not at all unlikely that the henchman may belong to the one opposing that of his chief, as his influence and power in such a case may often be made much stronger. The ring contemplated, having no further object than the honors and spoils of office, is formed upon the mutual-consideration principle—a kind of "you tickle me and I'll tickle you" understanding.

Our lawyer, we will say, belongs to the political party opposite to that of his leader, and is of the self-styled "highly respectable" class; or is, in other words, one of the aristocrats of the village. He belongs to one or another of the most aristocratic churches, and is one of its chief pillars. He attends the prayer meetings and all the social gatherings of the church, and exhorts frequently and piously upon such occasions. He prides himself, perhaps, upon his qualities as a speaker, and attends all public gatherings which in his opinion may be regarded as very respectable, in order that he may find an opportunity for making an oratorical display, and thereby increasing his popularity. He knows little of his profession, being too superficial to apply himself to its study; and what little law he is master of it is more than probable he picked up among his brother lawyers. With the exception of the few traits here mentioned, together with some others, he is much like his master—lacking, however, the peculiar organizing ability of that individual. But he has all the subtle hypocrisy of his chief, and can talk sweetly and piously to you by the hour; rubbing his long

bony fingers in true Uriah Heep style, while he is inwardly plotting some dirty scheme for your ruin.

It is necessary, now, for our autocrat to have a rendezvous, where he can meet often with the rank and file, and display to them his great political attainments and demonstrate to them what a wonderful fellow he is. He finds this, usually, at one of the village stores; and, as all merchants like to see a good many around, thinking it good for trade, the proprietor is soon under our autocrat's influence, and the ring is now fairly formed. Any scruples which may trouble the conscience of the merchant in connecting himself with such a ring are soon overcome by the craft of the leader in foreshadowing to him high hopes of the honor and profit which are to be his portion in the future. The merchant is perhaps naturally an honest man, but is weak; he has not the necessary strength of mind to withstand the subtle sophistries and temptations with which he is assailed, and finally binds himself over to this Mephistopheles, body and soul. He, too, is likely to be an active church-member, which position lends great weight in rural townships. Being naturally pleasant in manner, polite and courteous to all, he is, of course, quite popular. This trio now forms the inner circle of the ring. Perhaps, if the village is large, and the right material is to be found, two or three more may be admitted into the inner circle, but the leader is too wary to admit any whom he cannot mold to his will. He prefers, beyond this, for the accomplishment of his purposes, attachés for special objects, which so influential, and apparently so respectable, a league finds no difficulty in procuring. These,

however, are never admitted into the innermost sanctum.

The league now formed, the next step is to get control of the local journal, if there be one published. This done, nothing derogatory to the members of the league is published; pet schemes of their concoction are advocated; their interests in general are furthered and their dignity and influence increased by published references to them, and by the use of their names in a laudatory manner in connection with some local or political matter in which they have been concerned. To add to their prestige, they secure a few shares of stock in a bank, or in some manufacturing corporation, if such there be in the place. In these enterprises their skilful maneuvering is likely to give to each a directorship, and not improbably a complete control, culminating ultimately, of course, in the grief of the stockholders and in their own individual gain. They have now secured positions which cause them to be looked up to by the uninitiated as prominent and highly respectable individuals. This lends great influence in securing to them the popular favor. Still our crafty leader is not content to stop here. He has, in the manner stated, put himself in the way of influencing the church-goers and those in the higher grades of society, but there is still another class he must reach. He is of versatile make-up, and can not only conduct himself with circumspection among the respectable, the moral, and the religious, but he can also enter the circle of the "unwashed," and chatter more fluently and tell a dirtier story than any of them. He is therefore, in a sly way perhaps at first, the frequenter of most of

the groggeries in the village, especially as election day approaches; and by his superior mental caliber, joined with tact, free treating, and the fact of his stooping to mingle unostentatiously with the democratic class, he is sure to win their favor and secure to him or his candidates their votes in almost solid phalanx. A whisper may run around among the unsophisticated, perhaps, that this respectable political leader was seen in some corner groggery somewhat the worse for rum, telling ribald stories and drinking with the crowd; but if so, it is at once suggested that this is one of the liberties permitted to political aspirants; and as he is strongly backed up and sustained by some of the most prominent, influential, and pious citizens, it of course ends in a whisper, and is overlooked.

The league being at this point in good working order, and the time for election drawing near, the next move is to hold a primary, or caucus, for the choosing of delegates to a convention for the nomination of candidates for the higher state and national offices. Our trio now put their heads together and make up a "slate," which is almost certain to be the successful one. The matter having been all "cut and dried" beforehand, our leader, or one of his satellites, is placed in the "chair," and whoever the ring have settled upon is chosen, usually with little show of opposition; or, if much adverse strength is displayed, the matter is quickly disposed of by a vote of acclamation, as it is called, which has been previously arranged; arbitrary decision, in the midst of much confusion, is rendered in favor of the ring delegate, and thus the matter ends. Then in the conventions

themselves for the nomination of candidates for the higher offices, the matter is quite as skilfully and successfully handled. The slate has previously been made up by a conclave of these "bell-wethers," and the whole matter so cut and dried that such a convention is little better than a formal farce.

When we come to the *election* of officers, again the great strength of the league asserts itself. The candidates for the higher offices having been designated by the convention, and the slate for local offices made up by the ring, the activity now displayed by the league in laying their wires for the election of their candidates is truly wonderful.

The leader, having little other business, gives to this his undivided attention, seconded well by his cabinet and their co-workers for months before the election, while honest people are attending to the duties of gaining a livelihood in an honest way. If the ring has been formed by selecting individuals out of the two principal parties, which is not uncommonly the case, the game, so far as their township is concerned, is now completely in their hands. With candidates drawn from both parties, pledged to sustain the designs and purposes of the ring, all obstacles have been removed, and they have but to "walk over the course."

This selecting from both parties to fill the offices is plausibly contended by the league and their co-workers to be very fair and impartial, but the truth is that the candidates selected are the hypocritical knaves from both parties who care nothing for principles and are willing to lend themselves to a corrupt ring for the honors and *spoils* to be thereby derived.

from two representative journals of the two leading cities of our land.

The "Evening Post," of New York, in its editorial columns, quotes from the Philadelphia "Ledger" substantially as follows:

"The whole fabric of Philadelphia election affairs is permeated and undermined by fraud; and it is doubtful if any return made is a fair and square count of the ballots of the qualified voters, as in every instance when an electoral district comes under close examination there is either an exposure of fraud or reasons for strong suspicion of rascality; that comparatively few cases are examined, because the adverse vote returned against the cheated candidate is usually too heavy to allow of any inducement to carry the matter to a contest; that so great is the mass of villainy that it is buried out of sight, and that the methods of fraud are substantially as follows: It begins with myths on the registry lists. It is carried on by hired gangs of 'rounders,' 'repeaters,' and 'personators,' who vote, not only the false names on the lists, but the names of true men who have died, moved away, or are absent from home. They even vote on the names of men who are at home, and who on reaching the polls find themselves shut out. It is carried further by some election officers, who, if the 'rounders' do not come to vote as 'personators,' quietly add to the tally-lists, after the polls are closed, as many names from the registry list as will suit their purpose, and then throw ballots into the box to correspond.

"There is a variation of this last proceeding, in which the election officer takes out of the ballot-box

as many ballots as he can grab, and then replaces them with an equivalent number of the kind that suits him and his friends, the 'bosses,' and the 'rings.' If all this fails, there is a still further resource in the 'count.' When it comes to this, 'the fellows inside' simply put down to each candidate whatever percentage of the actual vote they think necessary. Usually this is conclusive, but even it sometimes fails, and then the final resort is to alter the returns. In most instances this is done in a corner, secretly, furtively, as all scoundrels try to do their work, but occasionally in the face of witnesses, openly, and with audacious insolence, as in the Fifth ward at the last election."

The "Post," in commenting on the above, says:

"It will be seen that this swindling is systematically carried on, notwithstanding the safeguards provided by law.

"There is in Philadelphia, as in New York, a stringent registry law, which when enacted it was supposed would put an end to fraud, but how easily it may be evaded is shown by the 'Ledger' when officers whose duty it is to execute it are determined not to. Probably," it continues, "these officers could defeat any similar law, no matter how carefully contrived it might be.

"Rascality knows no political distinctions. A knave will as readily assume Republican as Democratic patriotism. This is as true of organized swindling as of individual rascality. The 'ring' notoriety of Democratic New York is fairly matched by the 'ring' notoriety of Republican Philadelphia. Our contemporary seems to believe that the citizens

Those not conversant with these matters have little idea how successfully the vote of a township may be, and often is, manipulated by a little shrewd maneuvering of this sort on the part of a few wily politicians.

The result of such combinations, which are common throughout our land, is to make a complete farce of popular government. A township thus ruled is ruled as despotically, and at times as disastrously, as was the city of New York under the reign of the notorious Tweed.

It may be held that such a ring would soon be broken up and its leaders denounced. The facts, however, show to the contrary; that this despotic sway of the few is often maintained for a series of years; and that in a small township they often command such a power that if an individual values his own peace of mind or private interests, it is dangerous for him to expose and denounce their rascality. These leagues are therefore suffered to continue on from year to year, successful in their operations, probably unsuspected by the masses, yet known to the few, whose mouths are effectually closed by prudence or lack of courage to attack so formidable a power. When not made up of individuals drawn from the two principal parties, these leagues cannot be quite so formidable, it is true, nor exercise so despotic a sway; but the power of combinations formed in their own respective parties is by no means insignificant, and is quite sure of securing the vote of its party, if not of the township. If the vote is likely to be a close one, money flows as freely as whisky. The league knows well that if successful all expenditures

will be returned out of the public crib, increased, perhaps, a hundredfold. Thus it is that men are dickered with for their votes as for their cattle. It is the two or three in every township who make politics a study, a profession, who take control of the political machine. The masses are but jumping-jacks, who, in the hands of these political jugglers, perform at such times and in such manner as may be directed by those who pull the wires. And when the true character of the average politician is remembered, is it to be wondered at that it is the dance of death to the most of our hopes, our aspirations and desires, which we are so often called upon to perform?

I have been somewhat minute in pointing out the political corruption that exists in our rural districts, for the reason that many are under the impression that such corruption exists only in our large towns and cities, and that our rural districts are usually free from political intrigues and rascalities. Such not being the case here, what, then, may naturally be expected of the large towns and great cities where the temptation to corruption is far greater, and the chance of detection proportionately less?

It is like the repeating not a thrice but a thousand times told tale to speak of the corruption practiced in our large cities for the election of public officers; and although it is a matter which may not be wholly ignored in this connection, I will try not to weary the reader with that to which our attention is so often called. Here I can hardly do better than to bring to my aid editorials that fell under my eye, while I had this subject under consideration,

of Brotherly Love are beginning to despair of securing a fair representation of their interests in the conduct of affairs. The citizens of the metropolitan district began long ago to despair of anything of the sort. New York has been governed for years by a Democratic machine. Philadelphia has been governed by a Republican machine. There is no working difference between the two machines. The aim of each is to substitute its own will for the will of the people. In either case, the whole course of political events, including the nomination of the candidate, his election, and often his official acts, is marked out beforehand; and the people are called upon to ratify the proceedings only because a formality of that kind is a legal necessity.

"There is nothing in this that ought to surprise us. We find here merely conformity to a universal law of human nature. Given a certain number of men, and certain temptations and opportunities presented to them, and it may be predicted with almost absolute certainty that the temptations will work and the opportunities will be regarded in the same way, by whatever diverse social, political, or, for that matter, religious, names the men may call themselves. Is there, then, no remedy?

"The question cannot be shortly answered; and besides, we are considering now, not specifics for the situation, but the facts of the situation. What ought to be is plain enough. All elections, whether held under the law or in parties, ought to be free and fair elections. With these guaranteed, let us debate principles, and policies, and measures, and men, and let

the majority decide. Without this it seems scarcely worth while to debate at all.

"This may be called ideal; but it is well sometimes to look at the ideal, if only for the purpose of wholesome comparison with the actual."

And so we have here given us, no doubt, a true and fair *exposé* of this matter, and one certainly not overdrawn. Need we wonder that these "knights of the quill," though themselves long accustomed to mix in the fight to further the ends of one or the other of these political machines, should sometimes, when stopping to reflect upon the rottenness of our whole political fabric, cry out in their despair and ask, "Is there no remedy?"

Need we wonder, either, that those priding themselves, no doubt, on being very practical, should deem it useful to set up an *ideal* for the purpose of comparing it with the actual, that they may catch a realizing sense of the distance our government has drifted (and it is still drifting) away from that high standard of securing good order, liberty, and justice to all, supposed at the commencement to have been inherent in, and inseparable from, its organization. Perhaps, also, they do this for the purpose of indulging for a time the unsatisfied soul within them in its longings for a more peaceful and perfect state of existence.

Most effectually does the writer for the "Post" strike at the root of the matter in saying that "there is nothing in all this *expose* of knavery and corruption which ought to surprise us; that "what we find here is merely conformity to a universal law of human nature;" and that "when these temptations and

opportunities are placed before men, it may be predicted with almost absolute certainty that they will yield to them."

There is no disputing this; and therefore we say, if we are to have a government worth living under, a world in which "life is worth living," these "temptations and opportunities" must be removed; and the only successful course for removing them is to remove the *cause*. Now, what is the cause? Is it for *honor* that men make such rascals and vagabonds of themselves? In fact, is there any honor in filling positions gained through such rascally methods? Is there any honor in filling positions where the vast majority of our associates are blackguards, hypocrites, thieves, and liars? No! Every sensible person knows that there is no honor whatever in entering the race with such a crowd, or in sitting in their council if successful in winning an election.

Therefore, it is not honor, neither is it patriotism, that is usually the incentive which prompts men to seek for political office. It is the *perquisites*, the *spoils of office*, that the politician seeks. It is, either directly or indirectly, private gain that tempts the aspirant.

Were it possible to do away with the perquisites of office, so that the pay of the office-holder would be reduced to a fair compensation for the service rendered, what a scattering there would be among our self-styled patriots who occupy government positions! There are, no doubt, some good men elected to our state legislatures, also to our national congress; but the number of these is much smaller in proportion to the whole than in the infancy of our republic,

and every year the disproportion becomes more and more marked as politics becomes more and more a profession.

The degrading methods which it has been found necessary to adopt in securing a nomination and election are sufficient to debar the best citizens from allowing their names to be used as candidates. When an honest man is asked to use his influence to elect an ignoramus or scamp to a political position, with the suggestion that the clique of the latter will work for him in turn, he is pretty sure to turn aside in disgust. And when a still more degrading custom, now prevalent, is insisted on, that a man shall set himself up for office, or be set up by his friends, and then make an effort to gain his election by paying out his "barrels" of money, or by stumping the country, electioneering for himself, or bargaining with others to do this—when, I say, such disgusting performances are asked of a man who respects himself, he is sure to decline the position, leaving it to be filled by a meaner man. Such being the tactics usually resorted to in choosing those who are to make and execute our laws, what may we naturally look for as the general standard of character among our public officers? Even should honest men, at times, be elected, they are powerless among a vast majority of selfish rogues who act only from personal interest, and throw principle to the winds. Then, again, men molded by nature to be honest are likely to trip and flounder amid dishonest surroundings; the temptation of some Credit Mobilier is more than they can withstand, and they are brought to grief.

Continuing this subject, I will now present to the

reader a few extracts from an article entitled "Money in Elections," contributed to the "North American Review" by Henry George. Mr. George, after citing cases in which from $25,000 to $80,000 had been spent in running for Congress, and after speaking of several of our Western states as "notoriously rotten" in their political affairs, says that, after all, "it is neither to the large cities nor those Western states that we must go for the most flagrant election corruption, but to the older agricultural communities where population is most stable and the voters are in largest proportion of 'native American' stock.

"Practical politicians say," he affirms, "that there is more buying of votes among the rural population of Long Island than there is in the city of Brooklyn; and in sheer and flagrant corruption there are many agricultural districts of the state of New York that outdo the city."

He cites the Thirteenth Congressional district, composed of Dutchess, Putnam, and Columbia counties, as being "notorious in this respect," and speaks of a candidate for Congress who spent $150,000 in his election, beating a competitor who spent $75,000. "In this district," says Mr. George, "substantial farmers, the owners of even five and six hundred acres of valuable land, men of position in their neighborhoods, are said habitually to sell their votes; the prevalence of the custom being illustrated by a story of a candidate who, going into a country village, asked, 'How many voters have you in this township?' 'Four hundred,' was the reply. 'How many of them are floaters?'—*i. e.*, merchantable voters—continued the candidate. 'Four hundred,' was again

the answer. Four persons," Mr. George goes on to say, "of whom one was a deputy-sheriff and two were policemen, were arraigned for bribery in this district and tried before a judge who is reputed to have spent $20,000 in getting his place; they were prosecuted nominally by a district-attorney of the same ilk, and counsel for the defense made no scruple of asking how many there were in the court-room and in the jury-box who had not been concerned in like practices; and, finally, the men were acquitted, though nobody seems to have doubted their guilt."

And what seems to be a matter of no less significance to Mr. George is that such transactions are so common as to excite little or no comment. In fact, spending a fortune to gain an election, he thinks, seems to be regarded as a virtue to be rewarded rather than a vice to be punished. The man alluded to, he says, who spent $80,000 in a Congressional race and was beaten, instead of being sent to the penitentiary, was sent, as a reward for his political generosity, to represent the American republic at a European court.

A more recent example of the influence and power of wealth in providing us with our law makers has been furnished by one of our states, usually regarded as remarkably conservative and exemplary in its political character, but whose legislature was bribed into electing to a seat in our national legislature a senator committed to the behests of monopoly.

And so examples by the thousand might be enumerated, showing the corruption in our elections; in fact, we can hardly pick up a daily paper without

finding such. But enough, I think, has now been said upon a matter of such world-wide notoriety.

It was said by one of our early statesmen that if ever the time should arrive in our republic when the spoils of office became the paramount object of our legislators, then would the republic be doomed. If this period has not already arrived, we are wonderfully deceived by appearances.

Then we have "the press," which should be the guiding star of the citizen in political matters, but which is almost universally partisan, and therefore not reliable. Imbibing fully the party spirit, the newspaper lends itself to the most infamous misrepresentations, defamations, trickeries, and downright falsehoods, to promote the interests of its favorite machine. It would perhaps be saying too much to accuse it of wilful falsehoods in the discussion of *measures*, for herein men may honestly differ; but so unscrupulous is it in speaking of individuals who are candidates for office that the average voter, who must needs get his information largely from the journals, goes to the polls and casts his ballot without knowing whether he is voting for a saint or a demon. Sometimes, when some overburdened soul is filled to overflowing, there will come a wail from the press like that heretofore cited, when the truth is revealed, and not only is the whole political fabric shown to be rotten to the core, but our system of government is also virtually acknowledged to be inadequate. But these are rare instances, for usually the press subserves the interests of its party with remarkable fidelity, and is therefore of little value politically to the citizen. And so, to sum the matter up in a few

words, the political machinery in our republic is so managed and run by politicians that the honest, well-intentioned citizen has no choice left but to sacrifice his vote or cast it for the political hacks and ambitious aspirants designated by those who run the machines.

This states the matter just as it is. In all sincerity, then, let me ask, is *popular government* so managed and controlled anything more than a *popular farce?* But enough as to the *modus operandi* for the election of those who are to *make* our laws; let us now turn our attention for a time to their administration.

Composed, as the administrators of our laws usually are, of that same professional class of politicians which make up the body of our law-makers, and surrounded by similar influences, it need not be surprising to find that the laws are administered with a strong leaning in favor of the wealthy few under whose auspices they are instituted. Seats in the judicial chairs, from the highest to the lowest, being reached through political influence, neither a high degree of competency nor an unswerving devotion to justice may be expected in such a judiciary. Not even such a man as Sir Francis Bacon could withstand the temptations of his position; and, though it is not a matter to be proven as to how far bribery is carried on among those who fill our judicial chairs, there is little question as to its prevalence.

Bribery is thought to be shorn of much of its evil by the establishment of a jury system; but here, again, justice stands more than an even chance of being thwarted, as in this case it may be, either from

incompetency, class-bias, or bribery. Let him who has been reverently impressed with the majesty of human laws, and the adequacy of our jury system for enforcing them, sit for a few terms in the jury-box, and such delusions can hardly fail of being dispelled. Out of every rank and occupation of life, twelve men are here gathered together to render a verdict according to the evidence; prescribing terms of settlement between parties if it be a civil case, and, if a criminal one, depriving a human being it may be of liberty, it may be of life. Of these twelve jurors, some, perhaps most, are uncultivated, narrow, and bigoted in their views, and easily influenced for or against the party or parties in the controversy, according as such may belong to the same or a different class or cult.

The meager compensation allowed for the services of the jury, and the fact that its members are usually dragged from their occupations, and their personal interests left to suffer from their absence, often cause hasty decisions. The better judgment of some is overborne by a desire to gain a speedy discharge; while others, again, are influenced by class-bias to a mulish obstinacy that renders any agreement impossible except such a one as is manifestly unjust. Added to this, we have the professional juror, who hangs about the court-room awaiting an opportunity to serve for the miserable pittance awarded; and if the rule of the court (as is often the case) is that no compensation shall be made to the jurors except when a verdict is rendered, he is likely to assume the *role* of an advocate in the jury-room, and often forces, by his tact or audacity, an unjust verdict instead of disagreement, in order that he may secure his dollar or

half-dollar compensation. With a jury composed of such material as we have seen, or made up of men who have never before been inside a court-room, and including none whose education has been such as to fit them in the slightest degree for the sifting and judging of evidence, the high prerogative of securing justice between man and man is assumed by our courts.

Then, as if a jury so incapacitated were not enough to render the attainment of justice about as uncertain as a prize in a lottery, to the further confusion of this incompetent jury the parties to the issue are each allowed—or, rather, expected to bring forward—advocates, whose prescribed duties are, not to attempt to draw out all the facts, and thus further the ends of justice, but to suppress and conceal, so far as possible, all facts that may weigh against their respective clients. A further duty of these advocates is to badger witnesses, and, by their nefarious but consummate tact, to so confuse them as to cause real or apparent contradictions in the evidence. Thus in every conceivable manner the advocate attempts to make the false appear true and the true false. Added to this, after badgering the witnesses to the top of their bent, this pair of irrepressibles are allowed to "address" the jury, and granted full permission to use all their skill and impudence to deceive and confound their auditors. Thus they distort and twist the evidence until black is made to appear white, and *vice versa*, and the poor juror, provided he has an honest desire to render justice in his verdict, retires to the jury room so confused and dazed that he has only the slightest conception of the facts

or the merits of the case upon which he is called to decide. Trembling in this precarious balance, liable to be thwarted through incompetency, prejudice, or dishonesty, lies that justice which it is hoped to secure through the execution of the multitudinous laws with which all civilized governments are provided. He who is in any degree familiar with the inner workings of our courts, who seeks for nothing but pure justice, and who is unwilling to stoop to anything compromising his own self-respect as an honest, upright man, will be chary about appealing to these tribunals to obtain redress for his grievances. And who that is at all conversant with these matters does not know that there are still many other ways in which justice is robbed of her dues. Not alone are laws enacted in the interest of the rich and powerful, but it is undeniable that members of this class only too often escape the penalty of their transgressions. Once in a while an honorable exception to this is observed; but how little is known of the number of transgressions never brought to light in consequence of the wealth and power of those by whom they are committed! It is an undeniable fact, also, that crimes occurring among the opulent and so-called respectable class are often winked at by the officers of the law; that complaints are ignored, and indictments pigeon-holed, which would consign many of them to prison were the written penalty of the law faithfully imposed.

Who that has frequented our courts has not observed, too, that the treatment of those charged with breaking the laws is good or bad according to their known or apparent standing in life? The poor,

friendless wretch is brought to the bar like an ox to the slaughter, and, with but a mere show of defense, is sent to jail for one, five, ten, or twenty years with about the same nonchalance on the part of the stoical magistrate that he might be expected to exhibit when passing sentence of decapitation upon a mad dog. But how different is the case when the man of affluence, of respectability, of power, has been so unfortunate as to fall into the hands of an enemy whom bribery will not placate, and has finally been brought to the bar of justice! Instances are occurring continually where laws, which are popularly understood and declared to bear equally upon all, are broken and defied. Even from those laws whose prescribed penalty is the prison-house the culprits often escape unharmed and undisgraced, through the influence and power of wealth. Moreover, if officers of the law are found with sufficient honesty and courage to consign one of this class to the prison for his transgressions, the chances are largely in favor of his making his escape through the exercise of the pardoning power.

For example, look at the case of W. H. Kemble and his five associates, who, for bribery of the law-making power—one of the most heinous of crimes under our existing form of government—were sentenced in a Pennsylvania court to pay a fine of $1,000 each and to serve one year at hard labor in a penitentiary. Yet how quickly did the pardoning power come to the rescue! The political friends of Kemble and his associates sprang forward to their aid with alacrity, for fear, as it was currently stated, that those who had been caught might divulge secrets that

would consign more of these "very respectables" to the same fate.

The veil is here sufficiently lifted to afford a glimpse of that hideous skeleton in the legal closet, and to show that the administration of our laws is half farce, at least, throughout the land. When high-handed injustice is consummated by extending the pardoning power to such scamps as Kemble and his associates, the wonder to me is that the people do not revolt. Let an ignorant, wild Irishman, whose surroundings have always been of a nature that would naturally lead him to the commission of crime, be convicted of an offense not half so heinous as that of the parties whose case we have just been considering, and he might rot in prison before the favor of the pardoning power would be extended to him. But such is law and such is justice in our land; and such they may be expected to remain under a property system so eminently fitted to make rascals of mankind.

And now as to the character and multiplicity of our laws. Given, as a foundation upon which the superstructure of society is to be built, a system unjust in its every element—one in its very nature the most admirably calculated to array the hand of every man against his fellow—and what may naturally be expected to follow but a world prolific of vice and crime—a world in which all the evils to which human nature is prone are nourished and cultivated to their highest attainable perfection. Given, to make and execute laws for the protection of such an institution, a class of individuals the leading and influential portion of whom are shrewd, tricky, selfish, and un-

principled—to whom their own personal interests, ever intimately connected with party interests, rise paramount to and take precedence over the interests of society at large; who do not hesitate at bribery and all sorts of chicanery to reach these courted positions, nor at the systematic receiving of bribes as the legitimate perquisites of office—and what, again, may we naturally expect as a result? Why, just what we have! Laws, laws, laws, rise before us, and the energies flag and the brain reels in attempting to comprehend their infinity—laws that prescribe for the individual his almost every act, and which, were it possible, would no doubt attempt to govern his thoughts also.

These laws, often conflicting, and still oftener, from stupidity or knavery, blindly drawn, must at last fall under the decision of courts, more or less honest and competent, to unravel, thus giving scope for a swarm of unscrupulous lawyers who thrive the best under a code of multitudinous laws that befog the most.

We may wonder at infinite time or infinite space, but if one would have a true sense of actual infinity, let him set alongside of these the infinity of human laws for the protection of individual property. The shelves of huge libraries groan and creak under the enormous weight of the massive volumes containing the statutes by which mankind are to be governed.

O wonderfully wise and astute politician, lawyer, or legislator who would deride the simple government of our Future Republic, how much more appropriately might the laugh be turned upon you; for if there is one thing upon this wide earth that further denotes the imbecility of our existing civilization, or

is better calculated to excite the derision of the thinking individual, than this multiplicity of laws that you have enacted, and which hedge us about, God knows what this may be, I suppose, but I certainly do not!

Think of it, reader, for a moment; man is required to square his actions to conform to laws so manifold in numbers that life and memory, giving attention to nothing else, are not long and strong enough to master the veriest rudiments of those standing upon our statute-books; and yet the legislatures of state and nation still go on from year to year enacting —ever enacting—more, more, more! Previously existing and useless laws are sometimes rescinded, but these are often left to stand a dead letter upon the statute-books, while others equally absurd are brought forward.

And so the machinery of our government carries us on, from year to year, continually hedging us about with a labyrinth of laws of which it is expected that the average individual will have little, if any, knowledge.

Were it not that our eyes are blinded by immemorial custom, such a method for governing mankind would appear as the height of folly and absurdity. But it is not alone the countless numbers of our laws of which we have just cause for complaint. Based upon an unjust property system, and partaking, as they naturally must, of the character of those by whom they are concocted, as has been pointed out, our laws are far from securing equal justice to all. Starting from the pernicious fundamental principle, heretofore spoken of, that has ever lain at the root

of the system of private property, *viz., that all acquisition of property is to be tolerated and sanctioned as legitimate and proper which does not come under the head of direct appropriation*, as a natural result the object of the vast portion of our multitudinous laws is to maintain, and attempt to make appear sound, just, and commendable, the above wretched sophism, which has so long been accepted as the standard of morals for the guidance of men in their intercourse with one another.

Again, influence and power, lying always in the hands of those who have acquired property, though their numbers be comparatively few; and the interests of these ever being, or appearing to them to be, the accumulation of more; and this class being, either directly or indirectly, our principal law-makers, what else can be looked for but that our laws will be such as shall favor this class to the discomfort of all others? As evidence that such is the fact, we see the earth—which both humanity and good sense aver was given to mankind as the common heritage of all—pieced and parceled out among those having a prior claim by birthright; while the unfortunate individual coming later upon the scene has not space, save upon the public streets and squares, except by sufferance, whereon to place even the soles of his feet.

We see, furthermore, acre upon acre, and mile upon mile, of rich, arable lands—not only those owned by some English or Irish 'squire, or our Western bonanza potentate, but also by our avaricious farmers, all over our land—lying fallow, and running to waste for the lack of time or disposition of the owner to properly cultivate: he, having surfeited

himself with land, and being sustained by our laws, selfish and defiant, like the dog in the manger, neither cultivates it himself, nor allows of its cultivation by others. We see, too, that the favored few, the real lords and rulers of our land, have availed themselves to the utmost extremity of the advantages to be derived from the current system of morals, which sanctions that *indirect* appropriation which ever has been, and ever will be, a concomitant of the system of individual property. We see that these are enabled to gather into their hands the conserved results of many a hard day's toil by the struggling multitudes, and that in this *they are sustained by our laws*, and go on from year to year adding to their vast possessions through an income derived from capital. The unfortunate producers of this wealth meanwhile toil on—some in utter destitution and despair, others anxious, careworn, and weary—to maintain a mediocre existence for those whom they love and cherish with a devotion that language is impotent to describe.

It is in support of such injustice, such inequality, that the greater proportion of our laws are devised and enacted; thus, even under the most liberal of so-called civilized governments, virtually making the vast majority of humanity bondsmen—the very galley-slaves of the favored few. I am well aware that this is likely to be regarded, in our day, as strong or possibly as ridiculous language. I am aware, also, that the ideas expressed here, if deigned to be noticed at all, will be spoken of as the wild vagaries of some enthusiast or idiot. We shall be told, doubtless, that our laws are made by the wisest, the most

intelligent and influential, of our citizens, and that they bear equally upon all; and we shall be treated to all the other conceivable sophisms and falsehoods that the "pure cussedness" of an utterly selfish brain is capable of devising or of giving utterance to. We shall hear of the beauties, the equality, the justice of a liberal and popular government in which the most obscure individual, by the right of suffrage, stands equal with the greatest potentate. We shall be told that our sentiments scandalize the most humane and just government that has ever been established upon the earth; that they malign those who founded and fought for its existence, as well as those who have struggled and died for its perpetuation.

But let me not be misunderstood. I have not attempted to draw a comparison between our own and other governments. I take no exception, as before stated, to ours being called the best government, as a whole, that has ever been established upon the earth, as, in truth, I believe to be the actual fact. Neither would I intentionally pen a word that may be construed as casting a shadow of reflection either on those who founded or those who have maintained our republic as it exists. The highest honors are due to him who earnestly and fearlessly struggles for that which to him appears to be the good, the right, and the just.

Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, and others equally deserving of our highest encomiums, founded a republic that seemed to them, no doubt, to promise that which should bestow upon mankind the equality, justice, and happiness which humanity ever longs for

and aspires to attain upon earth. It was a system of government the most beautiful in theory, the most flattering in promise, that had as yet been established upon the earth; but it enfolded in its bosom that monster, *Individual Property*, whose deadly virus had not yet become fully apparent, but which nevertheless has been poisoning the nation's very life-blood. Unless this be eradicated, it will ultimately lead to the destruction of the republic. Now that the masses of mankind are reaching the state of being which revolts against all tyranny, no government can ever be long perpetuated that suffers the seeds of injustice to take root and flourish within; and it is against all knowledge of humanity, all reason, and all history, to entertain the hope that injustice in our laws will be eradicated, or an equal chance will be granted to all mankind for happiness, while our present system of private property remains in vogue.

Temptation to further his own selfish interest has been, and may be expected to continue, too powerful for the average human being to resist. No doubt at times when, for instance, as in the inception of our republic, the souls of men are stirred up from their very depths by flagrant wrongs that seem no longer endurable, and when the *noblest* step forward to assume the helm of state—no doubt at times like these individual interests may for a time be subordinated to the interests of society at large; but, the government once established, the personal emoluments which through it, under our existing property system, are held out to men, must assuredly sooner or later draw into its service persons of low moral ideas,

who, making politics a profession, and not hesitating about using the most corrupt methods in order to win, will soon drive the worthier to the wall, and then the public interests are sure to be sacrificed to personal gains. This has been the history of our government. Every year since its establishment degeneracy has been marked in the type of its legislators and executives, until the honors formerly identified with these offices no longer exist. The offices are now sought for chiefly by that intriguing class heretofore described in these pages, and for the purpose of promoting their own personal interests.

It is strictly in accordance with the law of cause and effect that the older our country grows, and the more men learn of the opportunities which government offices afford them for the advancement of their personal interests, the more will men of a low stamp swarm beneath her banner; and hence this degeneracy will continue until our legislators and executives are composed wholly of blackguards and vagabonds who will be the subservient tools of the few monied potentates of the land. It is this toward which we are fast drifting; and if suffered to be reached, then will come revolution and a new order of things. This is inevitable unless the fundamental cause be removed.

We have but to glance about us to discover that we are driving on to such a contingency with the steam all on, the throttle wide open, and the brakes at our command impotent to check the speed in any efficient measure, while before us lie calamity, destruction, and death. With our national legislature not above the influence of money kings; with state

legislatures, as well as the executors of the law, from the highest to the lowest, ready in many instances to be bought or sold, and with our monied potentates well aware that the successful passage of any measure, however arbitrary or unjust, is only a question of the price to be paid, the ultimate result must be either the virtual bondage of the many to the few, or, as before said, a new order of things. Either this or revolution—or, rather, revolution first and a new order to follow. Already our public improvements to a great extent have passed, and are still rapidly passing, into the hands of a few wealthy magnates, who manipulate them to serve their own personal interests, to the great injury of the community at large. Paid lobbyists in the interest of these monied magnates, their pockets well lined with bank-bills, or with their principals' checks signed ready to be filled out as may be needed, congregate about our state and national legislatures, and are as much a matter of course there as are the legislators themselves.

When such a state of matters already exists, and when its evils are every day being rapidly augmented, let me ask, is that man mad who predicts for this country the future herein foreshadowed? Is he not mad, rather, who cries that "all is well," or who claims that, though things are not quite as they should be, our government—from the fact, as he will confidently assure you, that it is based upon the prerogatives of the people—must ultimately emerge from her corruption like pure gold that has passed through the crucible of the assayer? To such I would say that it matters little whether it be people or king that

reigns: if a government be founded upon principles of rank injustice, there must sooner or later come a change, a revolution, or destruction.

I am no pessimist, and I firmly believe in a happy and brilliant future for mankind, not only in our own land, but throughout the world; but I believe also that such a future can never be reached until a people plants itself firmly upon a basis of equal and exact justice between man and man, and of equal material prosperity and comfort for every living being who bears the stamp of humanity. To look, therefore, for the purification of a government, or for the general prosperity and happiness of a people, under a government that sanctions and cherishes the unjust and inhuman institution of private property, which through its very nature forbids the extinguishment of indirect appropriation, is to me quite as absurd as it would be to look for peace, happiness, and prosperity under the reign of a sovereign possessed of unlimited power, and whose delight it is to tyranize and destroy.

Who is so blind that he cannot see that our "popular government," so called, is but a misnomer, a will-o'-the-wisp—that we in reality have no such a thing as a popular government? Who cannot see that money is the king to which we must all pay homage, whether we would or not? With the wealth of a nation in the hands of a few, comparatively speaking, not only in our own country, but wherever private property is recognized, the holders thereof, according to their possessions, are, and ever will be, the real rulers and magnates of the land. And this power, once secured by the few, gives not

only absolute sway over the many for the time being, but furnishes an impregnable bulwark of defense for its continuance in perpetuity. It is for the spoliation of one nation by another, and to resist such spoliation, as also for the protection of this institution of individual property—which is, again, the spoliation of the many by the few—that all these vast military forces and naval armaments that disgrace our age are called into existence.

Those who have gained vast possessions, upon which they live luxuriously and ostentatiously, know full well that they have appropriated to themselves the fruits of many a hard day's toil by their fellowmen; and they know also that in the nature of things property so acquired would not be likely to remain long in their hands were it not for the laws enacted for its protection, and supported by a military force adequate to their execution.

With a political machinery so manipulated that you have no choice but to either sacrifice your vote, or cast it for those subservient to the money power, it is idle, I say, to talk about the "equality" and "justice" of a "popular government in which the vote of the most obscure individual counts equal to that of the wealthiest." All such stuff is but a sop thrown to the multitude by political demagogues or those half-thinkers who have never glanced below the surface of these matters. The real living truth is that under the much-vaunted liberal and popular government of our republic the masses are governed by the wealthy few as effectually as are the subjects of Russia by the czar. Such is precisely the status of our government, and such must it remain so long

as this institution of private property finds sufferance. It is true that its pernicious effects are felt somewhat less, at present, in our own than in other lands; but with its continuance, as time rolls on, this difference will gradually disappear, and, so far as the promise of prosperity and happiness goes, we shall find ourselves upon a par with the older nations.

Many there are, no doubt, who are willing to admit the truth of all that has been said here of the unjust character of many of our laws—of their unequal and unjust bearing upon society, and of their improper and sometimes iniquitous execution; but still they are not willing to admit that the seed of most of this evil lies in our system of individual property. They will admit that these laws have been largely enacted for the protection of private property, and that they are rendered necessary thereby; but they will not admit that our laws may not be wisely and justly constructed and executed under the present property system. Nor is this at all to be wondered at. Individual property is a time-honored institution under which our fathers dwelt (I will not say and were happy), and under which we have all been reared and educated. As with the countless numbers in the ages past, our very thought and being have been deeply imbued with its seeming propriety; it has been systematically woven into every fiber of the mind, and to question now the utility and justice of what has so long been held as sacred seems, no doubt, to most minds a sacrilege upon which they may hardly suffer their thoughts to dwell.

I would remind such of the fact that as knowledge has advanced systems as time-honored and sacred as

the one now in question have fallen and become obsolete. The truth is, that nothing which has been established by man is too sacred to be questioned or overthrown by man when it can be shown that it is unjust and evil in its tendencies and results. Belief in a theory contrary to this has ever thwarted and must continue to thwart our aspirations toward a higher and happier state of existence. Man's career upon the earth is one of continual reverses, but upon the whole his way is ever upward. Commencing at the very bottom of the ladder, he has advanced only as he has gained knowledge by experience. What was fit for his progenitors, in the infancy of society, is not fit for him to-day; neither will that which is sufficient for to-day be such a thousand or even a hundred years hence. Should, then, this institution of individual property, originating in barbarism, and under a moral *régime* in which might made right, be held too sacred to question, or even to overthrow? Should we not establish in its place a system more in accordance with the intelligence, the morality, the humanity of the age? It seems to me that, like a suit of old clothes which the youth has outgrown, and which has become dilapidated and soiled, the present system should be cast aside as unfit for further use.

Taking the position that the general character of our laws, and the corrupt manner of their execution, cannot be changed for the better, but must be continually going on from bad to worse, while this institution of private property exists, I call upon those everywhere who sympathize with their kind — the lovers of humanity, the thoughtful, the noble, and

the brave—to fix their minds deeply upon this subject, and try to discover for themselves what is the the truth concerning it.

To my mind it is clear that some of the principal elements of human nature must be changed before a hope can be cherished that peace, prosperity, and happiness will reign to any great extent in the world, under this institution of private property. It is natural to eat, it is natural to drink; the desire to be well clothed, housed, and warmed, is natural; but this institution of private property, stepping in and locking up, as it does, in the hands of the few, the greater portion of the means by which such blessings are obtained, is continually thwarting the many toilers in the realization of their strongest, dearest, most laudable hopes, while it is a continual menace to even the existence of many people. So what have we to hope for, let me ask, while this hydra-headed monster of evil remains to steal the bread from those who earn, to give to those who do not—a situation well calculated to foster and develop to the highest possible degree of perfection all the baser qualities of the human soul, and which is constantly besetting mankind with temptations beyond the power of human nature to withstand? Talk of the fall of Adam having introduced evil into the world; why, this system of private property has been, in my judgment, the direct instigator and cause of more evil than all the race of Adam, or any other progenitor, could ever have dreamed of with it unknown! It is this, more than all other causes combined, that has educated mankind to that gross selfishness which at present characterizes the human race, and which makes semi-

brutes of us all. We need not deny it; the best are tinctured with this brutal selfishness, and it makes the worst worse than even the brutes themselves. The very essence of the accursed system is to excite mankind to grasp after that which rightfully belongs to others, and to appropriate to themselves the product of another's labor. Call it honest, do you, when one man, possessed of more shrewdness or natural ability of a certain sort than his fellows, absorbs the fruits of the life-labors of thousands, and riots in luxurious living, while those he robs are famishing for the necessities of life! I care not if with his ill-gotten gains he endows universities or builds temples to the unknown (or what he calls the known) God, he has grasped that which was not his own, and which he has no business with, either to appropriate to his own selfish purposes or to dispose of in any manner whatsoever. But, after all, it is not so much the individual as the system that should be condemned; for the individual but accepts the privileges accorded him by this pernicious institution of which society approves. Society virtually says to the individual, "If you can outwit your fellow-beings, robbing them through artifice, deceit, fraud, or any sort of rascality, while keeping at the same time within the pale of the law, we not only grant you this privilege, but will laud your endeavors, and will reward you with honors in proportion to your success."

Abominable as is such a standard of morality, recognized and sanctioned as it is by our laws, accepted by the individual as a guide, and sustained by public sentiment, is it at all strange that we find selfishness developed to a most remarkable extent, and that to

add to his possessions the individual takes advantage of all the privileges accorded him by the law. Is it even to be wondered at that, since they are well aware that the difference in the evils is more in name than reality, the unfortunate class — the victims of the more able and astute—should overstep the prescribed bounds into what the law recognizes as crime, and make their appropriations in a more direct manner?

I repeat that, while I by no means hold blameless the individual who makes use of such methods as the law and public sentiment sanction for augmenting his possessions, and particularly those cormorants who, already bloated with a surfeit, still grasp for more, yet it is after all this inhuman institution, the system of individual property itself, against which I would more particularly hurl my denunciations.

As the world is to-day, that man is justly censurable who fails to make provision against sickness, old age, or the wants of a family dependent upon him. Thus it is that through this system of private property there comes an arrow dipped in gall to pierce continually the soul of the benevolent, the kind-hearted, and the humane. The wants of suffering humanity are always appealing to him for amelioration, while affection as constantly whispers in his ear, "Be prudent! yes, more, be selfish—else you and those dependent upon you may also find yourselves destitute." There is but one escape from all the deplorable consequences that follow in the track of this institution, and that is its entire subversion. This accomplished, there will be found no further need for laws through which to govern the world.

With the ample material blessings of which Mother Earth is so prolific shared equally among mankind, this inordinate selfishness, which has so long been inherited, nourished, and developed among men, must necessarily lose much of its force. Such changes will then naturally and readily follow in the association and intercourse of man that, for the maintenance of good order in society, no further power will be required than that of a pure, refined, and intelligent public opinion unaided by any statute law. Laws, therefore, as heretofore stated, have no place in our Future Republic; the duty of our magistrates and counselors will be to act as wise coadjutors, advisors, arbiters, and instructors, to guide and direct humanity in the pursuit of all those blessings which may tend to promote its comfort, its prosperity, and its happiness upon earth.

CHAPTER VI.

FINANCE.

We will now glance at the System of Finance adopted in our New Republic. Exchange notes of various amounts, issued by each of the Great Republics of the globe, were used as the measure of value, the medium for the purchase and exchange of all property, and for the discharge of all dues. This money passed current over the whole earth.

The great divisions or republics of the globe were as follows: North America, South America, Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia. To each of these were attached the islands adjacent. A large portion of the Capitol building at St. Louis was devoted to the uses of the Treasury Department. Here was printed and issued the money of the Republic, and here were the offices and apartments of the Treasurer and his associates, who had the general superintendence of the finances.

A Treasurer for the republic was chosen by the House of Magistrates, his term of office being five years. He was subject to deposal at any time by a majority vote of the same body which conferred the office upon him. The duties of this office consisted of a general superintendence of all clerical work pertaining to the Treasury Department; but all matters connected therewith not coming legitimately under

the head of clerical duties were required to be referred to and acted upon by the House of Magistrates.

All notes issued by the Department bore the lithograph signatures of the President and Treasurer of the Republic. These notes were issued in denominations varying from five cents to ten thousand dollars. For amounts less than five cents copper coin was used. All business being transacted upon a cash basis, such a thing as credit was unknown. Every community had its treasurer. There was also a treasurer in each of the cities to perform the duties arising from the collective interests of the several communities contained therein. These treasurers were chosen by the same method adopted in choosing the magistrates. The office of the city treasurer was at Science Hall; while an apartment for each community treasurer in the cities was set apart in each dwelling. Out of the cities the treasurer's office was at Library Hall. Each community treasurer was required to keep a record of all moneys received and disbursed, the books of which were open at all times for the inspection of the magistrate and his council. Unless in a city, he was required to make a report quarterly to the Treasurer of the Republic of the amount of funds in his treasury, and also of the general condition of his community. If the community had been unfortunate in any way, or if newly organized and necessarily requiring to expend more or less in improvements, all such matters were definitely stated. Community treasurers in the cities made their quarterly reports to the city treasurer, collective interests were adjusted, and the city treasurer made his report to the treasurer of the Republic, as if the city were but one

community. From these reports the treasurer of the Republic caused to be made up quarterly an adjustment of balances. This called for a specific remittance to be made to the general treasury from the more prosperous communities, according to the amount of their surplus, for distribution among the newly organized and less prosperous communities, and also to create a fund to aid in the founding of new communities.

As all unimproved lands were regarded as the property of the Republic, applications for the organization of new communities were made to the House of Magistrates when the existing communities became over-populated. Land for this purpose was set off, and aid extended to place the new community in a condition adapted to comfort and self-support.

The treasurer's report, showing the adjustment of balances, having been made up and approved by the House of Magistrates, notice was given to each community treasurer outside the cities, as also to each city treasurer, of the amount his community or city had been assessed, and this amount was promptly remitted to the treasurer of the Republic. To each of the newly organized or more unfortunate communities a remittance was then made by the treasurer of the Republic in accordance with his approved report.

A fund was constantly kept in reserve in the National Treasury, and if from any unusual cause, such as damage by fire or flood, the funds in any of the local treasuries became exhausted before the usual quarterly adjustment, notice from the treasurer of the community wherein such calamity occurred

being given to the treasurer of the Republic, the matter was laid before the House of Magistrates, and an appropriation was made and promptly remitted to the community in need.

Each of the Great Republics of the globe usually flourished within itself, without calling upon the others for assistance; but in the event of some great disaster befalling it, such as the destruction of a city by fire, the failure of crops to a large extent, or any other great calamity by which much property was destroyed, the treasurer of the Republic in which such disaster occurred notified the treasurer of each of the other republics of the misfortune, and stated the probable amount required for relief. The matter was then immediately laid before the House of Magistrates of each of the several Great Republics; appropriations were made in accordance with the necessities, and these were promptly forwarded to the distressed Republic.

Here, reader, we have presented to our minds that practical charity which did not palsy the hand that received. Who shall say that life upon earth under such a state of civilization was not a joy indeed? Here the highest human ideal had become practical, and mankind over the entire face of the globe had learned to live together as one family, mutually assisting one another to the attainment of the highest happiness which it is permitted to man to realize. That a day will come when a state of society similar to what I have foreshadowed here will actually exist upon the earth I have little less doubt than I have of my own existence. But before that day can arrive, or before we can well get a fair start up the ladder,

mankind must be educated to higher and nobler things than those which principally occupy the attention of the present generation. Systems and customs must first change, but the change that is paramount to all others is a change in our system of property.

The system of finance, like the government of the New Republic, was organized upon the broad humanitarian principle of the universal brotherhood of man—the principle that the stronger and more favored are in duty bound to assist the weaker and less favored. Mankind was in fact one universal brotherhood, working together as one family for the mutual welfare of the race.

I can readily anticipate the principal objections which will be offered to the existence upon our earth of such a state of society as I have foreshadowed here.

First, the whole scheme will be hooted at as wild, chimerical, and totally impracticable; because it is the verdict of experience that every innovation, and everything beyond the focus of the beholder, has been, and probably always will be hooted at while man exists upon the earth.

Second, it will be contended that a system under which the more successful are called upon to aid in the support of such as are less fortunate would tend to paralyze all effort to attain material prosperity—on the part of the assisted through the ease with which they might have their wants supplied, and on the part of the helpers from the fact that they would be called upon to contribute toward the support of

the less prosperous and, as it might be claimed, the less enterprising and industrious.

That there is much apparent force in these objections, more particularly in the latter, the writer readily admits; and it is his intention in the course of this work to meet these questions fully. He trusts that he may be able to show that they are not nearly so formidable as they may at first appear, and that they really offer no obstacles which may not be overcome. Such a system of finance as has been marked out in this chapter will no doubt prove a subject of derision to the bigoted, custom-bound financier, and to the superficial thinker, the same as the writer's theory of government, given in a former chapter, affords amusement for the average legislator, politician, and hidebound conservative, confined to the rut marked out by their semi-barbarous ancestors. However, no one will deny, I presume, that if such a system of government, and of finance and adjustments, as has been outlined in these pages could be made practical, mankind upon the earth would be raised to a condition corresponding somewhat with the ideal of the race. Shall it be held, then, that a position so ardently desired is beyond the possibilities of man? For one, I must strenuously maintain that it is not.

On our way, however, to this blissful state there is one change which may be made in our financial *régime, under the system of individual property*, and which in my belief would be of incalculable benefit to mankind. This change is one which is now being agitated to some extent in our country, namely, the complete substitution by the government of a paper currency in the place of gold and silver coin. We

have seen that such was the money adopted in the New Republic, and it is therefore fitting that we should here dwell for a time upon this question.

Striking at once to the core of the subject, we find that the principal argument for using gold as the basis of our circulating medium rests upon what is claimed to be the "*intrinsic value*" which that metal possesses. Now, I shall assert boldly that there is in gold but the merest fractional portion of that inherent value claimed for it. The relative current value at which gold is now held has been assigned to it by the fiat of law and the common assent of mankind. By what standard are we to measure the inherent value of gold? Certainly not in this case by its money value, as that would be a begging of the question, it being claimed to be a substance or factor naturally adapted to money usage *on account* of its intrinsic value. There is but one standard for measuring the intrinsic value of gold, and that is the one by which the value of everything else must be determined, namely, its natural adaptabilities to the uses and benefit of mankind. Tried by this standard, which is the more useful to mankind, gold, or that baser metal we call iron? Which could mankind better afford to dispense with, gold or iron?

It takes but a glance to discover that, judged by all their natural uses, iron is more useful, and therefore more valuable to mankind, than gold. "Yes," you say, "but iron is much more *abundant* than gold; it is not fair to leave this out of consideration." Let us look, then, at this question of "abundance." It is true that there is much more iron than gold to be found upon the earth, but taking into con-

sideration the normal demands for each, the uses to which they may respectively be applied, we can hardly say that iron is, relatively at least, more abundant than gold. And this question of a normal demand is one that certainly should be taken into consideration in measuring the supply of any article. It can hardly be denied, I think, that, relatively, or in proportion to the normal demand for the two metals, gold is quite as abundant as iron.

It would be too long a digression for this work to enter into a statement of the various uses to which these two metals are naturally adapted, and the question of their relative abundance must therefore be left to the reader's decision. It should be remembered, however, that the use of gold as money is to be disregarded in deciding the matter. The truth is, there is upon the earth an abundant sufficiency of both gold and silver to serve all the useful purposes to which these two metals are naturally adapted. Hence there is hardly room for doubt that, except for the abnormal value which has been assigned to these two metals by custom and the fiat of law, the value of neither would be but a trifle, if any, greater than that of the other metals. It is the use of gold and silver for money purposes, and this alone, that makes these metals scarce in the uses to which they are naturally adapted. Is it not quite probable that if the use of gold for money purposes were abolished there would be even less demand than now for its use in other ways? Take away from gold the fictitious value which has been accorded to it in the way specified, placing it thereby within the reach of all, and I much doubt if many

would care to ornament their persons with it. The fashionable world, we may feel sure, would discard it in a moment, and in their disgust it is quite likely that, like the Utopians, they might have all they possessed of it run up into chamber-mugs.

I hold, therefore, that were we to dethrone silver and gold from their present fictitious eminence by abolishing their use as money, restoring them thereby to such purposes only as they are by nature adapted for, the enormous quantity of gold and silver coin which we now have on hand would be likely to give us a surfeit of those metals for ages to come. I repeat, then, that it is the use of these metals for money purposes, and this alone, that makes gold and silver relatively scarce.

Now let us give our attention for a few moments to the consistent, logical argument of the hard-money advocate! This individual claims that because gold is so scarce (made scarce, let it be remembered, only by reason of its money usage), its procurement costing nearly its whole value in labor —in other words, a dollar's worth of labor for a dollar in gold—it consequently possesses intrinsic value proportionately! Sensible argument, logical indeed! —is it not, reader?

That the cost of procurement, or, as we usually say, of production, is the correct rule, *in the main*, for measuring the value of a commodity, I shall not deny; but that the cost of production *necessarily* determines the value, I certainly do deny. For example, suppose a plot of ground where ordinarily five bushels of potatoes have been raised, after receiving from the gardener an amount of labor equal to the cultivation

of the above yield, should from drought, or some other cause, produce but one bushel; would that one bushel be regarded as possessing an intrinsic value equal to the cost of production? Again, suppose we are producing an article at an expense in excess of its normal demand, and devoting it to uses for which an article costing but a nominal sum would be equally well adapted; does it follow that the intrinsic value of such article must necessarily equal the cost of production?

A story is told of the origin of the use of gold as money, which I trust may not be uninteresting to the reader, or unprofitable to relate here. Somewhere in Asia, as the story goes, was an immense mountain, or, properly, mountainous cone, described as being about five miles in diameter at the base, and of about an equal height. It was foretold by some diviner—of which there were many in those days—that somewhere within that mountain was a substance, differing from any yet seen, which would be held in high estimation by mankind if once procured. The king of the country, who was now quite a young man, and whose name was Gold, at once set a million of men at work digging for this treasure. As the lives of many of these were sacrificed in the effort, he added others to keep good the number, and so the work went on through several generations, until at last, when the king had lived to be an exceedingly old man (we know from the Hebrew Scriptures that men lived to an extreme old age in ancient times), and the mountain had been cleared away to the level of the sea, a yellow substance was found, supposed to be that predicted by the prophet.

An examination was then commenced to discover to what use it might be put whereby it would benefit mankind. Well, after much thought and much experimenting, it was at last found that about the only use to which it was adapted was to work it up into finger-rings, ear-pendants, and other gimcracks of a similar nature. This was indeed a serious dilemma to be encountered, after all this toil and great expectations, but the king, being a very adroit personage, like many of the astute bankers of our own age, proved himself equal to the emergency, as the sequel will show. He first had all the yellow metal stowed away safely in his vaults, and then issued a mandate declaring that henceforth this substance should be used as money in the place of beads, shells, blocks of rock-salt, and other articles of small value which had heretofore been employed for that purpose.

Actuated by self-interest, this shrewd potentate put forth the same argument which his hard-money followers have continued to voice to our own day, namely, that a commodity must necessarily possess intrinsic value in proportion to its cost of production. Settling himself to this conclusion, he found, upon entering into a minute calculation, that under this rule the measure of a day's labor would equal a particle of this yellow metal about the size of a kernel of wheat. It was thus that the intrinsic value of gold was first determined, and thus was constituted a measure of value which has continued down to our own day.

But this is not all, or even the best part, of this story. Such was the power of this king that he soon compelled all the monarchs and peoples through-

out the known world to accept his money, in such amounts as he chose to declare, and render him an equivalent in their products. He also conferred upon the beautiful shining metal his own name—GOLD. So distinguished and powerful had the king become that upon his death there were decreed to him divine honors. Statues of this yellow metal were therefore made bearing the inscription, "King Gold," and these were set up and protected in the market-place of every city and town throughout the whole land. It was thus that gold first became an object of worship—a god.

At first this king was worshiped through the statues made of the metal that represented him, and then, insensibly, as time rolled on until the king had long been gone, the worship became transferred from the king to the metal itself. And well may it be said that no other god that has ever been constituted an object of worship has commanded such universal homage, or held such powerful sway over the minds and souls of men, as has this god—Gold. Amid the idols set up by a thousand religions, each of which is anathematized by the rest, this one powerful little god, Gold, holds invincible sway over all. Time, that terrible iconoclast, has been powerless here, for each succeeding age has become more and more ardent in its devotion to Gold—more determined to seek *him*, though all other gods may frown.

This story will have to be taken for what it is worth, without having anyone to vouch for its veracity, but it seems to me that it well illustrates the fallacy of the argument that would base the intrinsic value of gold upon the cost of its production. The

bottom fact in this matter really is that gold possesses intrinsically but the merest modicum of that relative value which has been assigned to it by its money usage. Now, why might not this relative value be just as well assigned to a piece of leather, paper, or anything else, as to gold? The article or substance used for money purposes should be that, in fact, which possesses less intrinsic value than any other article that can be found suited to the purpose, because the more intrinsic value such article possesses, the greater will be the waste, as it fills a place in which an article possessing the least inherent value would be quite as serviceable. Paper, therefore, is the natural substance to be used for money purposes. As a security, gold, with nine-tenths of its value assigned it by the fiat of law, is little better than paper with ninety-nine-one-hundredths assigned by the same power. The trouble is, we have become accustomed to regard gold as real wealth, an article of utility to mankind in proportion to the relative value accorded to it, when it is nothing of the kind. It is but the shadow of wealth, a makeshift which, by the common assent of mankind and the fiat of law, has been made the representative of wealth. Why not confer this same power upon a government note, which would be an equal and more direct security, while there would be no waste in floating such a currency?

Let us hear what John Stuart Mill has to say upon the money question. He says, "There cannot, in short, be, *intrinsically*, a more insignificant thing in the economy of society than money, except in the character of a contrivance for sparing time and

labor." Again he says, "What one person lends to another, as well as when he pays wages and rent to another, what he transfers is not the mere money, but a right to a certain value of the produce of the country, to be selected at pleasure, the lender having first bought this right by giving for it a portion of his capital. What he really lends is so much capital; the money is the mere instrument of transfer."

Here, in a couple of sentences, the status of money is clearly defined; and defined as a mere instrument in the transfer of the capital, itself *intrinsically* a most insignificant thing. It would almost seem as if we were really behind the barbarians in devising a system for the convenient exchange of commodities. Mr. Mill speaks of African tribes that have been equal to the establishment of a unit and standard of value without the use of any real thing whatever. He says: "They calculate the value of things in a sort of money account called *macutes*. They say one thing is worth ten macutes, another fifteen, another twenty; but there is no real thing called a *macute*: it is a conventional unit for the more convenient comparison of things with one another." But when this fallacy of the intrinsic worth of gold is demonstrated, the fears which now arise in regard to substituting in its place a paper currency in government notes will, it seems to me, be quickly and effectually removed.

Such fears will at least be removed from the minds of those who are willing to see; but that those who may swell still further their enormous possessions by having things remain as they are will acknowledge conviction is hardly to be expected. As a

bona-fide security, I see no advantage which the gold coin has over the government note of a responsible nation, which is a legal tender for the payment of all dues, both public and private. In the gold coin we have for security the common assent of mankind to accept in the payment of all dues an article to which has been assigned a fictitious and extremely inflated value; while in the government note we have the direct mandate of the nation that the sum specified shall be received and accepted at full face value in the purchase and exchange of all commodities and in the payment of all dues. The one security is indirect and complicated, the other direct and simple; hence the latter is the better, and, it would seem to me, really the safer. The great trouble, as I have said before, lies in regarding gold as *real wealth*. Once get this fallacy out of our heads, and there will be no trouble in establishing a circulating medium, not only efficacious in the exchange of commodities and the payment of all dues, but which will not cost its relative value to produce. If this cannot be done, then it is time for us to turn to the barbarians for an example. Notes issued by the government are unquestionably the normal and proper circulating medium of a people, and these, in my judgment, should not be a promise to pay anything. What I would recommend would be what might be called Exchange Notes reading substantially as follows:

"*This note bears Exchange value for ....., and is a legal tender for the payment of all dues, both public and private, throughout the United States and its territories.*"

My objection to notes issued by the government written with a promise to pay is that they imply redemption. There is no necessity for the redemption of such a note as I propose.

It is impossible, in my judgment, for a government to issue a circulating medium that would afford a more ample security to the holder than the one given above. It certainly affords all the security that gold does or can give, as the chief security afforded by gold rests on its being made a legal tender in the exchange of all property and the payment of all dues.

But what is all-important in regard to such a currency, or of any currency, is *stability*. Inflation or contraction of the currency is the rock upon which the people have so often come to grief.

One of the arguments used in favor of gold as the basis of our currency, and of making all paper currency redeemable in it, is that from the limit of its production an excessive issue of the currency is not likely to take place. The argument loses all its force, however, when it is understood that banks may and do issue their own convertible currency, in amounts many times in excess of the gold in their possession. There not being a tenth part of the gold coin in existence that is required for a circulating medium, to meet this lack, as well as to provide a much more convenient currency, individuals and corporations, though professing to take gold for a basis, are privileged to issue their notes, redeemable in gold, for a several times greater amount than they have, or are expected to have, of the gold to redeem; hence there follows a continual shifting of the volume of the currency, as it may please those who are privileged

to issue it. Moreover, the privilege being granted the banks to issue their notes as they may desire up to a certain limit, and to contract at their pleasure, the consequence is that when there is a loss of confidence in the community, and money ceases to circulate in its ordinary volume—the very time, in fact, when more currency is required—the banks, for their own protection, having out more currency than they can redeem, begin at once to contract, to withhold and draw in their notes, thereby greatly aggravating the difficulties, and often plunging the community into bankruptcy and ruin. It is this playing fast and loose with the circulating medium that upsets and plays the mischief with all business relations. It is always the amount of the circulating medium afloat which regulates values. This greater, the values of all commodities become correspondingly greater, and *vice versa* when less. This understood, the necessity for a stable circulating medium becomes clearly apparent.

Constant shifting of the volume of the currency renders all contracts entered into for any length of time so precarious as to destroy the confidence of the community. With what safety may one loan or borrow in the face of the certainty that the dollar or the thousand dollars which he loans or borrows may possess a nominal value a year hence of double, or one-half, what it possessed at the time of the loan?

This privilege of expanding and contracting the currency at pleasure, that has ever been extended to individuals and corporations I regard as the most pernicious of all financial absurdities. Playing see-

saw with the currency is an evil that should not be tolerated. It is the normal function, and therefore the duty, of the government to regulate the volume of the currency, and this is sufficient reason why the government should have this whole matter in its hands.

There ought to be little difficulty at this age of the world in fixing upon the amount of currency required for the exchange of commodities. It should be fixed by the allowance of a certain *per capita* amount, and there it should remain, changing only as the population or wealth either increases or diminishes, except in cases of extreme necessity, such, perhaps, as a war. There should be an act in the Constitution prescribing the amount *per capita* to be issued ; and if I advocated hanging for anything, I would advocate it for the officials who violated the act. But this advantage of stability in the circulating medium, which can hardly be overestimated, and which may be reached through the system I advocate, is one which it is utterly impossible to attain under the impotent, stupid, crazy financial system now in vogue.

Were there no other advantages to be derived from the adoption of a circulating medium fixed at a certain amount *per capita*, as I here advocate, that of stability would seem to me to be sufficient. But there are other advantages. One of these, to which I have already alluded, I now propose to revert to and speak of more fully. I refer to the substitution, as the basis of a circulating medium, of an article that costs next to nothing for one whose procurement, or production, as we usually say, costs so much as does that of gold.

One of our hard-money advocates, writing upon this subject a few years since, put forth the statement that there was eight billion dollars in gold coin then in existence, and that every dollar of this gold had actually cost a dollar's worth of labor to produce. How near this may come to the actual truth I know not, but we are all aware that the amount of gold coin in existence must be prodigious. Accepting this, then, as the approximate sum, we have eight billion dollars' worth of labor taken from agriculture, manufacture, and commerce, and expended in procuring a substance of small utility to mankind, to be locked up in the vaults of our money kings, for them to sit on and hatch out a spurious progeny, which they offer as their best "contrivance," to be used as an instrument in regulating the exchange of commodities. All right, no doubt, for the money kings, but the people who have so long and so patiently submitted to this bungling "contrivance" have had to suffer terribly.

Now, candidly, popular as our financial system seems to be to-day, I regard the enormous expenditure which the procuring of an article to be used as the basis of a circulating medium entails as one of the greatest wrongs, and certainly the greatest folly, ever indulged in by mortal man. All this wealth sunk in a "contrivance" to regulate the exchange of commodities, when the African barbarians even were able to achieve the same result through their imaginary macute! Does it seem possible that this can really be, and that we are not dreaming? With all this expenditure, what have we really got in this "contrivance?" A fraud—a most consummate fraud!

Do you deny it? What, then, do you call the issuing of bank notes payable in gold coin to an extent three, five, and even ten times in excess of the gold coin which the banks have in their possession, or, as it is not in existence, could possibly obtain if called upon to do so, and palming these notes off upon the people as affording ample security because redeemable in gold?

Had they the gold sufficient to redeem these notes, the fraud would still remain, because gold does not possess intrinsically one-tenth part of that relative value which the fiat of law has assigned to it. Now, if a more barefaced fraud than this has ever been legalized, sanctioned, and popularized, I really do not know what it is. It is precisely like that of an individual giving his check on a bank for one hundred dollars when he has no more than ten dollars on deposit there—with but this difference, namely, that, while the receiver of the check is likely to call for its payment in a short time, the parties holding the promises to pay in gold—the bank note—are expected to pay interest for its use and not present it for payment; or, in case they do, to take their pay again in other promises of the same character.

Why, let me ask, should our currency be based for security upon a single substance, when there is not enough of that substance to redeem a tenth part of it? Why not let the security fall *direct* upon all property, thus saving all this bungling, roundabout course for accomplishing the same end? Gold in its money capacity is nothing more than an *indirect* lien upon the productions of man and nature, while the money I advocate would be a direct lien upon them.

The fact being evident that it is quite unnecessary that the article itself used for money purposes should possess intrinsic value, then, granting, even, that gold did possess an intrinsic value equal to that claimed for it by its advocates, would it not be a shameless waste to go on gathering it at such enormous expenditure for this purpose? But as gold does not possess an intrinsic value equal to a tenth part of its current relative value, then is it not an outrage that the masses of the people should be made to suffer from its holding its present position?

Inconveniences may arise from abolishing gold for our circulating medium—or rather as the basis of it, for it is never the customary circulating medium or currency of a country; but inconveniences are mere chaff in the balance; and positive disadvantages, difficulties, and injuries must show themselves huge indeed to outweigh the two reasons I have given here for the proposed change. Other reasons for such a change might be given, but these two—stability in the volume of the currency, and the enormous expenditure required for the procurement of gold—it would seem to me, are quite sufficient to overthrow all objections. But let us now turn our attention for a time to finding out what these objections are likely to be.

The civilized world having adopted gold as the standard of value, I shall not contend that any one nation could cut loose from this standard without suffering some inconvenience; but that the result would be serious, terminating in more injury than benefit, I certainly cannot admit. Most emphatically do I assert that such a course could not be injurious

to a country in the condition of the United States, and it is from the point of view of an American citizen that we are now regarding this matter. It is appropriate and natural that all important changes instituted for the benefit of mankind should commence where the probabilities of success are greatest: our Republic is therefore the proper pioneer in this great financial change. The people of the United States did not feel it incumbent upon them to adopt the Old-World system of monarchical government, to weld together church and state, or to introduce many other Old-World systems, though to detach themselves from these systems was not only inconvenient, but cost a life-and-death struggle for existence. Shall we, then, on the plea that it would lead to inconvenience, and perhaps cause at the outset some considerable confusion of affairs, shrink from adopting a new financial system that promises a benefit to the masses of the people of this country unequaled except by that resulting from the adoption of our new system of government?

In order to answer the objection arising from the "difficulties" which it is contended would follow the rejection of gold as the basis of our currency, let us state once more what we would propose in its place. We propose issuing the Exchange Note, properly certified by the government, bearing upon its face the mandate that it shall be received as a legal tender in the exchange of commodities, and in the payment of all dues, and substituting it as a unit and measure of value in the place of gold coin, which affords security to no notable extent, and accomplishes at last no more than the proposed Exchange Note. "But," said a

business man to me, not long since, "experience has shown within the last decade that not even our own countrymen would accept such a note as you propose except at about one-third to one-half its face value in gold." This notion is entertained by many of our business men, and probably, I might say, by the vast majority of the people of our land to-day.

Among the masses, who do not look very closely into these matters, the idea pretty generally prevails, I think, that the "greenback" was not only guaranteed by all the strength of the nation, but that all the possible requisites for putting it upon a par with gold were extended to it, and that it took its stand beside gold as high in value comparatively as it is possible for a paper currency to reach. This is, however, a very greatly mistaken notion of the facts. The government itself put its foot, so to speak, upon the "greenback," and effectually determined its relative position as compared with gold, by refusing to accept it as a legal tender for the payment of duties on imports and for the principal and interest of the public debt. With gold retained as the basis of the financial structure, and such a discrimination made against the greenback dollar, what else could be expected but the result which so naturally followed? When parents refuse to recognize their own offspring, a suspicion very naturally attaches itself to the outcasts, and others are chary of bestowing upon them their confidence, trust, or affection.

It would be idle, it seems to me, to assert that, with gold abolished as the standard, such a currency as I have here proposed would not pass current at its full face, in our own country at least. Hence the

difficulties that might be expected to be met with in foreign countries are all that it is necessary for us to inquire into.

We shall be told, no doubt, that the people of foreign countries would not accept such a currency as we propose in payment for their productions —that they would not accept any obligations of this or a similar nature not convertible into gold. Well, why not? If they desire our productions, and the Exchange Note is quite as available for their purchase as gold, then why not accept it for that purpose, if for no other? But suppose they should absolutely refuse to accept it, what then? Why, it only remains for us to demand payment in gold for our exports, and use this gold in paying for our imports. The effect of this would be that we could import no more than the gold we received for our exports would pay for; but this, it appears to me, could be no very serious injury to the prosperity of a country having products for export equal to those of the United States. In case our imports exceeded our exports, for a time at least the gold and silver we hold could be used in payment of the balance against us; but no country should, or can, long continue to import in excess of her exports. In the case of the United States, such a proceeding is hardly presumable.

But, suppose our exports should exceed our imports, as would probably be the case, what then? Take the gold and silver of foreign countries at the same relative value compared with our own currency, as they are now taken, and make this a portion of our own circulating medium, if you like, or use it

for those purposes to which it is naturally adapted. But, rest assured, it would not be long after the adoption by any one country of such a measure of value and medium of exchange as is here advocated before gold would be discarded for money purposes the world over.

Another question that might be asked is this: "Could the people of a nation issuing no obligations payable in gold negotiate a loan from the people of another country, basing its measure of value upon gold?" Possibly a difficulty might be met with here, in the case of a young and struggling people, lacking means for the rapid development of their internal improvements, but I do not admit that in such case the inability to procure a loan would necessarily work injury to the welfare of the people. Collectively or individually, the safer rule is to pay as you go; develop, as you have the means within yourselves for developing. Running in debt is a poor rule for anybody.

Heaping up a debt, either with nations or individuals, is like having a stone fastened to the neck, and being cast into the sea. The interest on the debt is the stone which is continually bearing them down and not unfrequently sinks them in the end.

But whatever question for argument may be raised as to an indigent nation being benefited by a foreign loan, it cannot by any possibility apply to the United States. We have passed the days of our infancy, we are no longer in leading-strings, and we are certainly not dependent upon foreign loans for any purpose whatever. Having ample internal resources, we may flourish independently, either in peace or war. The

capital that is now continually flowing to us from abroad for the development of public improvements is more a curse than a blessing, as it stimulates uncalled-for ventures, and thus leads to speculation and disaster. We have capital sufficient among ourselves for effecting all public improvements, as fast as the country requires them; hence the more foreign capital is borrowed and brought here for that purpose, the worse off we are.

"But," you again ask, "might not the nation be benefited in the case of war if able to negotiate a loan from some foreign country?" For this brutal purpose, I wish from the bottom of my soul that it were not within the power of any nation upon the face of the globe to borrow a single dime. The ability to borrow in cases of this kind has already been the abettor of too many wars that have disgraced humanity. The loaning of money for such inhuman use is like furnishing the would-be suicide with a knife to cut his throat. How many nations have sunk themselves into hopeless ruin through the ability to command such loans; and how few there are to-day that are not struggling along beneath the weight of an enormous debt so contracted, and from which they would be free had they been unable to contract such loans! But, confining the subject to our own country, how does it present itself? We may be told that our last war could not have been successfully prosecuted except for foreign loans. Reserving our answer to this for a moment, let me ask, is there not a strong probability that we should have had no war at all except for the hope entertained particularly by the South of financial aid from

foreign nations? Might not the South have thought it better not to commence such a struggle, had she regarded it as impossible to obtain a foreign loan? I think that the probabilities are strong that, under such circumstances, we should have had no war. But suppose we had been forced into such a struggle, what then?

To meet the question fairly we must imagine ourselves at the beginning of the war, standing upon the financial basis I have laid down in this chapter—that is, having an established paper currency affording virtually a direct lien upon the combined property of the land, and being a legal tender for all indebtedness. Had our government stood upon such a basis, could she not have paid out her notes in the purchase of all needed supplies, and is there any question about our own people having accepted them at their full face value? Such being the established and legalized money of the land, it is absurd to argue that they would not. Had we stood upon such a financial basis we would have had no need of foreign loans to carry on that war. We had the men; we had the implements of war, or the means of making them; and we had the wherewith to feed and clothe the soldiers, as well as those not actively engaged in the struggle. What more did we require? We often hear it said, with a good deal of flourish, that "money is the sinews of war." This may be so in a sense, but, after all, money is not *the* thing required for waging successful war. What is required are able-bodied, brave men in the field, and industrious, energetic men and women off the field

to provide the implements of war, and to support the army and themselves while the war continues.

Borrowing money from abroad did no more for us at the time than could have been done had the government issued her exchange notes, and paid them out to her own people for what she might require. It did no more for us at the time, I say, yet had she taken such a course as I have advocated, how immeasurably better it would have been for the people; for, instead of owing an enormous debt to foreign nations, she would have owed an almost infinitely less amount to her own people only, which is equivalent, in a sense, to owing no debt at all.

It is well known that for the bonds sold to foreign nations to maintain the costs of that war we realized only about fifty cents on the dollar—that is, such a dollar as was paid out to our own people. I have not the figures for showing here how much was sacrificed in this way, but we all know that the amount was enormous. It is clearly evident, therefore, that maintaining a gold standard during the last war increased the cost of that war tremendously, besides putting into foreign hands a large portion of the debt incurred, when, except for the idea that it was necessary to adhere to a gold standard, the obligations of the government would probably have remained to a great extent in the hands of citizens of the United States.

Toilers, all over the land, who are struggling to gather together enough to pay your taxes to meet the interest on this war debt, I want to say to you that this is one, and but one out of many, of the direct, natural, and dire results of using, as the basis of our

currency, an article the production of which is attended with such enormous expense, while all purposes for which money is required could be far more efficiently served by the use of an article whose cost of production is merely nominal. The longer we go on procuring this mineral to be used for money purposes, the greater the waste, and the heavier will be the tax that will fall upon the people. It is, to my mind, the blind following of an absurd and reckless custom, that should long ere this have been rendered obsolete. It is for you, citizens of the United States, in whose hands rest the ballots, to say how much longer, at least in your own country, this reckless, ruthless waste shall be continued.

I have now brought forward and considered the more important objections which have presented themselves to my mind, and the principal ones, I think, that can be raised, against rejecting gold as the basis and standard of value, and substituting in its place a paper currency that shall rest on no shadow, no fictitious relative value, to be used as a medium of exchange and measure of value; and, as I regard the matter, the objections are but feathers against lead in the balance, when compared with the solid advantages which I have set forth in favor of such a change. What cannot be too often repeated is that the great difficulty which confronts us in dealing with this question, and the one which most befogs the minds of men, is their custom of regarding gold as possessing intrinsic value, inherent properties which may be utilized for the benefit of mankind, in proportion to the relative value now placed upon it; when in truth such is the furthest from the fact.

Let this false idea be eradicated, let it be understood that gold of itself does not enrich the individual or the nation to any important extent, and not long, do I apprehend, will the people of our country be in adopting a universal circulating medium, that will consign this creature of a bogus value, this delusion, phantom, will-o'-the-wisp, to its proper place in the economy of nature.

Now, why is it that gold is held so firmly as the basis of our currency, while it must soon become plainly evident to every intelligent person who will take the trouble to investigate the matter that the interests of the people at large demand a change?

I will tell you, reader, why this is. It is for the interest of the moneyed few—the class in whose hands rest the power and influence as matters stand today—that this matter should remain as it now is; it is in order that this class may *loan* their hoarded treasure, receive a fat premium for its use, and thus, by gathering into their hands the small accumulations of the struggling multitude, still further swell their already colossal fortunes. It is that they may issue their promises to pay (which they rarely expect to be called upon to do) in this comparatively worthless yellow metal, in amounts, two, three, five, and perhaps ten times in excess of the gold they have in their possession, and at the same time demand a premium for the use of these bogus promises. It is, in a word, that they may loan to the government and people the circulating medium necessary to the exchange of commodities, or whatever has exchangeable value, and receive a premium therefor; and this in the face of the fact that it is clearly the province

and duty of governments to issue such circulating medium or currency, and in such manner that the people will not be taxed for its privileges. Paying a tax for the use of gold as the basis of our currency, is virtually paying a tax for the privilege of exchanging our commodities.

There is little doubt that our bankers and the moneyed class generally who have examined this question are well convinced that incalculable benefits to the people at large would result from the establishment of some such financial system as has been advocated in this chapter, but the trouble is that they are too selfish to come out and admit this fact and give the proposed change their support. Knowing the weakness of their own argument, the policy of the hard-money advocates in combating those who differ with them upon the question is to resort to epithet, characterizing their opponents as 'shallow, and crazy ignoramuses, and by such other opprobrious names as may be called to mind. A cause may be regarded as more than half lost when this sort of argument is resorted to. As stated upon the introduction of this subject, there is no doubt that the change which I advocate in our financial system is quite practicable under the system of *private property;* and the question being found quite clear upon examination, and the measure one productive of incalculable benefits to the people at large, I have little doubt that some such change will ere long be effected.

But, reader, even this change in our financial *regime*, important as it would be in its beneficial results, is but a step toward reaching that high ideal

which I am laboring earnestly in this work to foreshadow, and which is no less than the "Federation of the World." It is the grandest, the most satisfactory, of all prospects, to look forward to a time when mankind all over the broad earth shall be banded together in Universal Brotherhood, the stronger assisting the weaker, as indicated at the commencement of this chapter, in mutual effort to make existence upon our planet the most happy and glorious. And this ideal, Utopian as it may appear to some, is one which I verily believe to be within the reach of human possibilities, though in my judgment it never can be attained under the system of individual property.

CHAPTER VII.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS.

In the New Republic the postal, the telegraph, and the railway services; the internal water transit; the foreign shipping and its necessary accompaniments of wharves, warehouses, and etceteras—in short, all works of a strictly public character—belonged to and were operated by the government. The highways, however (by which I mean the carriage-ways), were regarded as local improvements, and each community was required to construct these throughout the limits of their own precinct, after the plan heretofore noticed as closely as practicable, and to keep the same in repair.

A Bureau of Public Improvements had been established, the principal offices of which were in the Capitol building at St. Louis. Auxiliary offices were also located in all the cities throughout the Republic, and in many of the community villages. In the cities these offices were usually in Commerce Hall, and in the country communities, where required, in the railway stations. A Superintendent of Public Improvements was chosen by the House of Magistrates for a term of five years, and held office under the same regulations as regards deposals that were prescribed for the treasurer of the republic. Deputy Superintendents were also chosen by the same power, for

the same time, and subject to the same regulations. The power of the superintendent and deputies, like that of the treasurer and his deputies, did not extend beyond the mere clerical duties of their office; all more important matters pertaining to the management of the department being under the direction of the House of Magistrates.

Thus a system had been established for the construction and management of public improvements which saved a vast deal of that wasteful expenditure which now obtains through private adventure. In a a word, the public improvements in the New Republic had been made and were managed for public utility—for the benefit of the public. (I use the terms *public improvements* and *public works*, in this chapter, to signify such works as are constructed for public use, and include many not at present under the ownership or management of the government.) And here comes up that question which is now agitating, and which must continue to agitate more and more, both the scientific and political worlds, namely: What are the proper functions of a state? Our scientific philosophers are seemingly as widely divided in their opinions upon this subject as are our political magnates, while the same difference of opinion prevails as extensively throughout society at large. But this difference of opinion, after all, does not lie so much in what are the proper or normal duties of the state in the abstract, as in what may be properly demanded of the state in the exercise of its duties. To illustrate: the school of thinkers led or influenced largely by Mr. Herbert Spencer, who may be regarded as the present great apostle of Individualism *versus*

Communism or Co-operation, holds to the restriction of state functions to the narrowest limits compatible with the maintenance of man's rights. Now I, for one, do not object to this as a very proper definition of the duty of a state, though I differ with Mr. Spencer as widely as the poles diverge respecting what is required by the state for putting this proposition into practical operation. Mr. Spencer says, substantially, that matters both great and small—all matters that go to make up the interests of life, *save that of inflicting punishment upon the refractory*—should be left to individual and corporate effort; that all advance should be made along individual and corporate lines. According to Mr. Spencer, to lend its aid even to educate the people is not a proper function of the state; and not only this, but the individual has a moral right to resist taxation for any purpose whatever; in a word, to refrain from doing anything toward subserving the general interests or welfare of society. Such, in brief, is the limit to which Mr. Spencer and those of his school would confine the functions and powers of the state. "Hands off!" they say, "and let the individual work out his own destiny the best he may;" and this, too, under organized and established systems which, when allowed full scope, the most obtuse observer must be able to recognize, would impoverish and imbrute nine-tenths of the human race. No harmony of action beyond that of mere corporate co-operation, in which all interest is centered on the money which may be made out of it; no relief from a property system whereby the more shrewd, cunning, and unscrupulous, the more able in the art of money-gathering,

may filch from the laborer and producer the hard-earned proceeds of his ceaseless toil.

In another chapter I shall take occasion to call the reader's attention to the *heartlessness* of Mr. Spencer's teachings, confining myself here merely to a consideration of their *futility* as regards the subject in hand.

As the propounder of the great law of evolution, Mr. Spencer's name deserves to be, and unquestionably will be, honored while mankind inhabit the earth; but the singular stand which he has taken upon social and economic questions must detract much from his reputation; and this detraction, too, is likely to increase as time moves on. I speak of Mr. Spencer's stand in this regard as singular, because if his teachings were followed, and the methods he advocates carried out, they would lead man straight back into barbarism. It is usually among the more rude and uncivilized of peoples that this very idea of *independent, individual action in all things*, for which Mr. Spencer is so great a stickler, may be found developed in its highest degree. In proportion as people live isolated and independent of their kind, in that proportion will they remain barbarians. By mutual aid men advance toward civilization, and the higher the order of civilization, the greater and more complex must their interdependence become. This attempt to proceed *upon independent, individual lines* has kept what are called civilized peoples in the state of partial civilization in which we find them even to this day. It is through a greater degree of association for a common end that must eventually come that perfect state of society to

which both Mr. Spencer and myself look forward as the ultimate destiny of mankind. The trouble with Mr. Spencer seems to be that in his philosophy he has first assumed a *perfect* society, and then attempted to adapt to that society the institutions established by a very *imperfect* one. The difficulties he has encountered from this source—very apparent in his "Social Statics"—have been like those one might expect to meet in an attempt to drive a square peg into a round hole, the diameter of which is equal to that of the peg itself. This *laisser-faire* individualism might do in a perfect society, where every one could be depended upon to do right, but it is wholly incompatible with social order in the very imperfect society which now exists; and yet whenever and wherever Mr. Spencer attempts to reduce his philosophy to a practical form he extends the *laisser-faire* doctrine to the society which we now have.

To reach a perfect state of society, a transition period is necessary, and to this institutions must be adapted. Instead, however, of attempting this end by demolishing the barbarous and unjust systems which man in his ignorance has established, Mr. Spencer relies wholly upon *character* for attaining his ideal. I as much, perhaps, as Mr. Spencer, rely upon character as a necessary element; but how, I would ask him, is that high order of character necessary for the accomplishment of the great result in view to be developed while systems are retained that are naturally adapted to making rascals of us all? Now, it seems to me that the power to which Mr. Spencer would limit the state (that of chastising her

refractory children) would go but a short way toward maintaining the natural rights of a people.

Prevention, it is said, is better than cure; and even if the punishment of those who commit wrongs may be regarded as a prevention of wrongs (which is not a little questionable), such prevention as would leave no inducement to the committal of wrongs would certainly be far better. To fully carry out the proposition laid down by Mr. Spencer—namely, to protect person and property, or the maintenance of men's natural rights—it seems to me that it would be necessary to go much further than to remand to the management of the state such great public interests only as I have mentioned at the commencement of this chapter; it would require the placing under state control of all such matters as have been or will be hereafter mentioned in this work as belonging to the state in the New Republic. But as this would wipe out the private property system (which is to be recognized in what here follows), I shall not attempt tracing to its legitimate end what is involved in Mr. Spencer's proposition. I shall at present bring forward, as proper matters for state ownership and management, only such great interests as in their nature allow and are likely to be made productive of extortion and imposition upon the public, when controlled by individuals or corporations. That the telegraph, the railways, and all other facilities for public communication and transportation come under this head, there is little room for question. These are, in individual or corporate hands, monopolies of such a nature as to admit of the most rascally imposition upon and spoliation of

the public. They are not and have not been constructed for the public benefit, nor are they nor have they been managed to this end, but wholly for the benefit of the owners. It may be held that great public works would not be constructed for private gain under the present *regime* except that there is a public demand for them; but witness the falsity of this argument in the case of parallel railways, of rival steamship and steamboat lines, while those already in use are ample to meet the public wants.

There can be no denying the fact that very many of our public carrying adventures meet no public want, but are simply so much capital sunk and so much labor wasted. And when such is the case, who, usually, are the sufferers? Were they the devisers of the schemes, there would be little cause for regret, though the waste of labor would still be the same; but the fact usually is, that the leaders of all such adventures manage to shift the loss on to the public at large, and it falls upon those who can little afford to bear it. The projectors rely upon their skill to humbug the public to take the obligations of the corporation in bonds and stock, generally far in excess of the actual cost of the constructions. This excess they themselves pocket. Their method is somewhat as follows: A corporation is formed, and by representing that the scheme will greatly enhance their interests and prosperity, the yeomanry and other inhabitants of the country through which the railway (if the adventure be such) is to run, are induced to invest their spare funds in the undertaking, and are thus "roped in" to what usually ends disastrously. The railway once completed, the next step

taken by the leaders of the adventure is to so manipulate its management and falsify its earnings, should it have been in any wise successful, as to make it appear almost worthless as an investment. They then buy it in at a nominal figure. This accomplished, the scene changes and the aspect is quickly reversed. The almost lifeless carcass, slumbering like Rip Van Winkle upon the mountains, is now suddenly reawakened and becomes pervaded with activity; superhuman efforts are made to obtain freight for transportation over the road, and obtained it is at some price. The passenger business is, perhaps, not quite so easily managed, but many trains, whose occupants are largely deadheads, pass each way over the road.

The managers are now in a position for "cooking up" a flaming report of the road's earnings, which act is followed by a resort to that worst of gambling hells, the Stock Exchange. The report of the success of the road, made by the "highly respectable and honorable board of officers," is a glowing one. To all appearances a fresh mine has been opened, and he who is so fortunate as to obtain a large interest in it is sure to become suddenly rich.

Low at first, gradually the price of the stock advances, our "honorable board of managers" being asskilful in manipulating this in their own interests as we have seen them to be in the management of the road. Cunningly they pull the wires until the stock has been "bulled" to the highest figure which they think it will bear, when they cautiously "unload," and throw their worthless burden upon the back of the credulous public. The "honorable board of man-

agers" are then at liberty to seek for further emoluments "in fresh fields and pastures new."

This, I submit, is a fair illustration of how many of the railroad enterprises are managed in this country to-day. Yet there is no help for it save in the government becoming owner and manager of our public works.

Not a slight blessing to mankind would be the abolishment of the Stock Exchange. Yet it is a sort of necessary evil while our public works are owned and managed by individuals and corporations; but let the state assume the control of these interests and the mission of this institution would be ended.

I have pointed out one way in which a portion of the public are daily fleeced through the cunning and duplicity of unscrupulous railway managers. Now for another; and in this the spoliation reaches not only the few who are directly interested, but the whole public. I refer to the charging of exorbitant rates for fares and transportation. "But," says one, "such an abuse must naturally reform itself quickly by leading to the construction of competing lines."

This, at first blush, might seem to be the case, but a second glance shows that such a result is extremely doubtful; in fact, I am of the opinion that the more of these competing lines we have, the greater is the extortion. Where such competing lines exist it is common for them to combine, "pool their issues," and fix upon such rates of passenger fares and transportation as will *sustain them all*; thus throwing a heavier weight upon the public than it would be called upon to sustain if there were fewer roads or as many only as the public wants require. This is

now so notorious that it is unnecessary to furnish any illustration of it.

"But," say you again, "may not the public, through its legislators, limit the amount of charges to be fixed upon transportation, and thus protect itself against such spoliation?" Twenty-five years ago that method of reaching this difficulty did seem feasible, and at about that time a no less able writer than John Stuart Mill, in his "Principles of Political Economy" recommended that it be adopted. He said: "The community needs some other security for the fit performance of the service than the interests of the managers, and it is the part of the government either to subject the business to reasonable conditions for the general advantage or to retain such power over it that the profits of the monopoly may at least be obtained for the public. This applies to the case of a road, a canal, or a railway. These are always in a great degree practical monopolies, and a government which concedes such monopoly unreservedly to a private company, does much the same thing as if it allowed an individual or an association to levy any tax they chose for their own benefit on all the malt produced in the country, or on all the cotton imported into it. To make the concession for a limited time is generally justifiable on the principle which justifies patents for inventions, but the state should either reserve to itself a reversionary property in such public works, or should retain and freely exercise the right of fixing a maximum of fares and charges, and from time to time varying that maximum."

Affairs have changed within twenty-five years; and

whether such a remedy would or would not have been effective then, it is clear that it would not be now, at least not in the republic of the United States, however it might work in England, the country which Mr. Mill probably had in mind when writing. The railway and the telegraph magnates of our own country have become so rich and powerful that they can—and it is notorious that they do, to no slight extent—fill our legislatures, both state and national, with their henchmen; and when failing to elect enough of these for the accomplishment of their purposes, they buy those already in office. This is well known, and it is, therefore, unnecessary to say more upon the subject. The truth is, that these great corporate interests cannot be controlled by the state. On the contrary, they can, do, and will control the state in their own interests. "But," you ask, perhaps, "how much better in this respect would we be were the state the owner and manager of our great public works? 'State management,'" you say, "is not free of corruption; and, besides, the placing of so much power in the hands of the party in power would be likely to perpetuate its control indefinitely."

That corruption does exist, at times, among those into whose hands the management is assigned when public interests are controlled by the state, I shall not of course deny; but there is the best of reasons for believing that under state control there would be, among government officers, nothing like the amount of corruption that now prevails. The state being the owner of all public works, Goulds, Vanderbilts, Huntingtons, and those of their ilk, could no longer

have any object in electing or bribing public officials. That fact alone, I think, effectually disposes of this argument. We have lately had an instance, it is true, of the vilest corruption in our postal department; but if the offending officials have not had meted out to them the punishment which their crime justly deserves, it has at least been made so hot for them that neither they nor others will be likely soon to repeat the offense. When public interests are in the hands of government officials, these are closely watched both by the public and the press; hence, when offenses are committed they are apt to be brought quickly to light, and the offenders proceeded against. And so it will be seen that though corruption may exist under these circumstances, there is a remedy for it. But the corruption among public officials which I am criticising (I mean the selling themselves or their votes and influence to railway and telegraph magnates) cannot be reached, therefore there can be no remedy for it.

It is always better that matters of this nature should be so arranged that they may be met in a direct manner, as any indirectness and complexity in the method of proceeding against offenders always enhances the difficulties to be encountered.

Now as to the other objection, namely: That the placing of these great public interests in the hands of government would have the effect to perpetuate indefinitely the tenure of the party controlling it. I for one entertain a fear just the opposite of this. I would have these great public interests removed from corporate ownership and control, lest we soon drift into an oligarchy or plutocracy.

It is indisputable that the Republican party, though brought to the helm of state through the great slavery issue, long retained its position, not because of any great issue or issues wherein it was foremost in promoting the public weal, but from its subserviency to the great railway and other money-ruling powers. It was the money of these great monopolizing institutions that kept the Republicans in power, and this would have continued it in power indefinitely had not our great plutocrats regarded it as *cheaper* to buy up and make subservient to their interests and behests the leaders in the Democratic party. In this way, changes of the party in power may from time to time occur. But should these great public interests be left in individual and corporate hands, thus enabling their managers to still further augment their already enormous wealth, and power through wealth, the day is not far distant when these plutocrats will combine and *wholly* control the affairs of the country. An end to our republic will then have come, and we shall have an oligarchy or plutocracy in its place. Toward such a catastrophe we are rapidly moving.

Next, let us consider whether such management as would be efficient and satisfactory to the public is likely to ensue from placing our public works under government control. Fortunately we have sufficient precedent from which to form a correct judgment in this matter. It is conceded by those thoroughly conversant with the subject, and not biased by their interests, that in countries where the experiment has been made, state management is much more satisfac-

tory than individual and coporate ownership and administration of public interests.

Under state ownership it is quite improbable that two or three railways would be constructed where one would suffice to meet all public requirements. Unnecessary lines would be abolished, and exorbitant rates would cease to be charged as now upon lines having little or no competition. We hear it often asserted by those who have never given much study to the matter, or who are biased by their interests, that public works can be well managed only by those who have a moneyed interest in them beyond an equivalent for their services. To this view I dissent *in toto*. As a matter of fact, where there is a large moneyed interest, it is this moneyed interest that the managers carefully serve, and not the interest of the public. It is this moneyed interest that puts upon our railways, for the use of human beings, cars hardly fit for pigs; that takes chances on worn-out rails and rotten bridges; that keeps flagmen and switchmen at their stations when worn out for want of rest and sleep, and that does many other things which endanger life and limb. It is, in fact, for the very reason that the managers of our great public works usually have a large personal interest in them that they are run so unsatisfactorily to the public.

We have further testimony as to the efficient and satisfactory administration of public interests in the postal service, both in our own and foreign countries. Can any one reasonably find fault with the way this service is conducted in our own country? Is it to be supposed that letters would be carried all over

the United States for two cents under individual or corporate enterprise? Unquestionably the owning and conducting the great interests here spoken of come under the proper functions of a state, and this for the reason that under state ownership and management the people may be efficiently and satisfactorily served without being mulcted of their property and rights.

The changes which, from various causes, have taken place in the relations of governments and peoples during the past two or three centuries, and particularly within the last half century, render imperative the finding out what are and what are not the proper functions of the state. Such as are proper should be exercised and those not proper should no longer be assumed. This is daily becoming more and more apparent. The state, besides being a governing power, is properly the people, in their collective capacity, co-operating for all such purposes as may not be accomplished with the same salutary results through individual or corporate action.

A few words now as to the functions which, in my belief, are improperly assumed by the state, and for the assumption of which it seems to me she has long manifested a far greater readiness than for the exercising of such functions as properly belong to her. Under a properly established system the state would have nothing whatever to do with the regulation of conduct or morals, save in the enactment and execution of such laws as shall protect, so far as practicable, the rights and liberties of the people. Beyond this the regulation of conduct should be left wholly to public opinion, which, if not always infallible,

is the best arbiter that can be had. That public opinion may advance to the most complete state of perfection, there should be no restriction upon thought and speech, nor upon action so long as it does not trespass upon the rights and liberties of others. Morality, or right conduct, is not a thing so defined as to become a matter for state interference further than has just been stated. The same may be said as to opinions or beliefs pertaining to religious matters. From out a hundred or more different theologic beliefs, found in as many different religions, who is to detect or extract the truth, provided it really exists among them? It is absurd to expect that any one can do this. What right has the state, then, to say that every seventh day shall be set apart as a holy day in which the individual is not permitted to pursue his usual avocation; or to restrict the rights and liberties of the individual in any of a hundred similar ways? What right has the state to favor church property by exempting it from taxation, while the property of those who do not believe in church dogmas is taxed for its protection? It is unnecessary to pursue this subject further, it being clearly evident that the state is assuming functions which do not properly belong to her when she in any manner, even the most remote, uses her authority for making mankind either moral or religious.

A similar mischief is wrought through state interference with the rights and liberties of the individual in the manufacture, sale, or use of intoxicating drinks. I admit the many and deplorable miseries and woes arising from the improper use of spirituous liquors,

but I am conscious also of other indulgences which lead to results little, if any, less deplorable and injurious to the race. The mere admitting of the principle that the state has a right to interfere in any one such case unlocks the door for law to step in wherever it may please, thus opening the way which leads to the total suppression of all individual rights and liberties. Many ruin health and cut short their lives by excessive indulgence in eating; and this statement also holds good as applied to the sexual appetite. Physicians tell us that these, if not apparent to most mankind, are little less injurious and disastrous to human well-being than excessive indulgence in strong drink. Are you quite ready, then, to have the state step in and regulate *these?* If not, can you not see that, in admitting the state's right to interfere with the sale and use of intoxicating drinks, you are opening the door to this and a thousand other similar ways for subverting your liberties? Morals and religion, as well as the appetites and passions, good judgment affirms and experience proves, can be much better regulated through public opinion, education, and good counsel. Convince mankind that their lives will be happier, if temperate, humane, and just, and this will have an influence for good; while laws suppressing and subverting individual liberties by attempting to control the appetites or passions have always done more harm than good.

Another evil no less mischievous is state interference with the free course of trade or exchange of commodities. "We must protect our local industries by levying a duty upon imports," say a large

party in our own republic; and yet this is unquestionably a direct infringement upon those natural rights of mankind, the maintenance of which is a recognized principle in our Declaration of Independence, and one that has been loudly voiced by the American people. Compelling the individual to pay from ten to fifty per cent. tax, or more, for such foreign products as he may desire is, to say the least, rather a peculiar way of protecting his natural rights. It may seem presumptuous in me to attempt in a few sentences or pages to dispose of those great questions upon which volumes have been written, and yet, although the limits of this work will allow but a glance at the subject of Free Trade, still I do not feel at liberty to pass it without expressing an opinion.

The argument of the protectionist is that Protection, in the sense which I here use the word, is highly beneficial to the people of our own country at least, and for the following reasons: It creates a revenue for the support of the government; it promotes the growth and prosperity of internal industries, and affords, thereby, not only opportunity for the investment of home capital, but employment to our people in the production of protected products. Moreover, it builds up manufactories; the population about these is increased, and thus a home market is created which benefits in general the farmer, the mechanic, and the wage laborer. This, I think, will be admitted to be a fair summary of the principal advantages claimed by the advocates of protection.

Admitting the plausibility and in some measure the truth of the protectionists' theory as here stated, still I cannot admit that the levying of duties upon

foreign products is ever, in any case, a benefit to a people as a whole. That a few are enriched there is no question, but the benefit to the few is reached, I hold, through the injury of the many. Protection may stimulate a hot-house growth of population in a new country, but, like all hot-house growths, it is *unnatural*.

Suppose our country, upon the establishment of a government, had adopted free trade with all the world, and strictly adhered to it, what would have been the result? The result would have been this, that while our manufacturing facilities might not be as great, nor as many of our people be employed in manufacturing as now, it is probable that our country would be much more widely settled, and our lands more generally improved and cultivated. Whether our population would be as large, it is impossible to say. It is reasonable to suppose, however, that there would be a greater agricultural population, and fewer engaged in manufacturing; but to my mind the rapid increase of the population of a country is of much less importance than that the country should grow upon a substantial basis. I cannot share the general exultation of our press and people in the wonderful increase of our population; for, as affairs are now directed, this augurs so much more destitution and so much more misery.

The effect of protection is to multiply manufacturing facilities beyond all necessity for them. This is attested in our own country, whose manufacturing facilities have been already extended to such a degree that a half century's increase of population will be required to bring them to their normal level;

while our great warehouses are filled to bursting with superabundant manufactured wares. And so, since those engaged in manufactures are so far in excess of the number demanded, additions to our population must necessarily find employment mainly in agricultural pursuits.

At the time of the establishment of our government, we had a vast continent whose soil was for the most part uncultivated. The soil of Europe, on the contrary, had been so extensively appropriated that great numbers of her people had no other recourse for a livelihood but to turn their attention to manufacture. She had the facilities for the manufacture of nearly all such wares as we stood in need of, and she had a huge population to be benefited by the opening up of this new market. Conversely, her population stood in need of the products of which our own soil was so exuberantly prolific. Among these were cotton, grain, and such other produce as we at present to a considerable extent supply her. Now it certainly would have been the humane, and, as I believe, the economic, policy of our country to have established free trade from the very start, sending out to Europe and other lands the products of our soil, and accepting their mechanical and all other productions in exchange. A country flourishes best by the production of such articles as she can furnish to her own or foreign peoples at a cost less than the natural facilities of other countries will permit them to be produced at. That is the proper production of a country for which its natural facilities are best adapted; and unless an article can be produced in a country as cheaply as it can be imported under free

trade, it is not the part of economy to attempt producing it. Had the people of our own country acted upon this principle of political economy, we should never see invested in our varied manufacturing plants two or three times the amount of capital necessary to buy ready-made the wares they produce. There are other things, too, which we should not see. We should not see factories lying idle and rotting to the ground. We should not see them running on half time, or at half their capacity. We should not see the employees of these factories, when fully employed, living upon wages barely sufficient to support a tolerably comfortable existence; and, while but partially employed, in destitution and suffering, they and their families.

This leads me to a further consideration of the deplorable effect which protection has upon the interests of the laboring classes. By imposing a tax upon foreign commodities, capitalists engaged in manufacturing protected wares are unquestionably benefited for a time (say until their wonderful prosperity has built up a home competition that shall bring their profits down to something like a proper level); but the laboring class in general, whether employed in manufacturing or not, I hold, are always the losers by protection.

I admit that protection builds up new manufacturing enterprises, thus giving employment to many; I shall not deny that the wages of the direct employees are thereby enhanced, nor shall I contend that the laborers' wages in the vicinity of the great manufacturing plants, when not employed in them, are not, also, increased by the building up of these new

enterprises. But I do deny that either the extending of employment through protection, or the increased wages secured thereby, are really a benefit, either to those directly employed, or to the wage laborer, or the farmer in the vicinity. Protection does not benefit the laborer by furnishing him with mechanical employment while there are numberless acres of untilled soil in the country wherein he might maintain a far more comfortable existence. And protection does not benefit by increasing the wages of the laborer, for at the same time, to a proportion far beyond the increase in his wages, it enhances the cost of most or all that he uses or consumes. This may be denied, and a comparison between wages in our own country and in countries that have adopted free trade may be cited to disprove the assertion. But this comparison is by no means a proper one, for it is well known that the rate of wages in all new countries, with or without protection, is much higher than in old countries, as it also is in the newer portions of any one country. A comparison between wages in our own and in some of the old countries of Europe *maintaining protection* demonstrates not only that it is not protection which maintains a high rate of wages, but that protection has indeed very little to do with increasing the rate of wages.

There is a test by which the losses the laboring community sustains through protection may be very closely ascertained. It is this: since all wealth springs from labor, finding *the cost of maintaining protection* gives the loss to the laboring community arising therefrom. This loss consists, in part, in the

erection and maintenance of custom houses, and the paying of officials and employees connected with the collection of duties. To these expenses must be added the enormous profits which find their way into the hands of the manufacturers of protected wares—these profits arising from the increased and usually exorbitant prices which, through protection, manufacturers are enabled to obtain for their wares. But even this does not begin to measure the cost of protection or the great moral wrong which it inflicts upon the laborer. Protection is an infernal method for throwing the burdens of the state upon those least able to carry the load.

In the enhanced cost due to protection of the products which the laborer uses or consumes, *he* is made to pay, chiefly, for the support of the government, while, as he usually has little or no property, it is a monstrous injustice to compel him to pay anything for this purpose. Like our senseless and unrighteous system of finance, protection is not maintained because of a conviction that it is for the general good of the community, but because it is for the interest of the wealthy, who, not content with appropriating in various other ways the earnings of the laborer, have concocted this scheme, which taxes him largely for their benefit.

But if the levying of protective duties really accomplished all that is claimed for it by its advocates, still I would not approve of it. He who upholds protection must be sectional and more or less selfish in his views. When we set the welfare of one portion off against that of another portion, we cannot regard the whole family of man as one universal

brotherhood. If the people of one country are really benefited by protection, those of other countries are correspondingly injured by it. Hence, as we have no right to profit at the expense of another's comfort and happiness, protection is shown to be a moral wrong. But, as I have proved, protection does not benefit a people; on the contrary, it is a positive injury to any people adopting it.

Intimately connected with this policy of protection is the restriction which is sometimes placed upon immigration; and notwithstanding its boasted theory of affording equal rights and liberties to all mankind, I blush to own that this restriction is practiced in our country. The foulest blot upon the escutcheon of republican liberty was placed there when the United States forbade the Chinamen to come to her territory to make his home. Why should not the Chinaman have extended to him the same privileges that are extended to the Englishman, Irishman, Frenchman, German, or the people of any other land? These all came here in hopes of bettering their condition, as did the Chinaman; and with the same expectations came the ancestors of us all. Has the Almighty given us such a title to the soil of these United States that we may rightfully exclude others of the human race who may choose to come and settle among us? I think not. If he has given such a title to any people, this people must be the native American, the Indian, and we are all usurpers, as were our fathers before us.

Now suppose that any of the European, the Asiatic, or the African nations were to pass a law restricting us from settling in their domains, what, think you,

would be the result of such action? Why, a cry that would be heard around the earth would go up from republican America against this subversion of international liberty. Correct we should be, too, in resenting vigorously and indignantly such interference with the natural rights of man. Governmental restrictions of this nature do not evince that spirit which leads to peace and harmony, to a universal brotherhood, and the "federation of the world," but rather that which leads to national strife, pillage, and wars.

Another question connected with state functions, though standing, I think, upon more debatable grounds than those I have spoken of, must not be passed unnoticed. I refer to the propriety of the state's interfering with the matter of usury, or fixing of the rate of interest upon money. But prior to this question, and involved in it, is another to discuss of still greater importance, *i.e.*, the exaction of a premium for the use of money at all. Many good men contend that this should be prohibited, and yet I would say at the outset that, direful as we shall soon see the results to be, I cannot discover why, under the existing property system, this exaction is not quite legitimate, or how it can be avoided.

Under the system of individual property, money in the hands of individuals or corporations is as much their own as is any other property, to do with as they may desire; and the right of exacting a premium for its use is as legitimate as it would be to charge rent for a house, or for the use of any property whatever. Were the taking of interest forbidden by law, as some think it should be, while

use of capital, the reserved products of the labor of the multitude, until they ultimately lap up the conserved accumulations of a world. I know it is contended that huge fortunes are apt to dissolve and melt away; that what the father gathers, the children scatter, and I shall not deny that this is often the case; but I hold that this is by no means general, for we shall find, if we will but take the pains to inquire, that the bulk of the large fortunes to-day lie in the hands of those who have inherited them. And even when fortunes are dissolved and scattered, into whose hands do they fall? Do they not fall again into the hands of the very same class who held them before—of the shrewd, the unscrupulous; into the hands of those who have a talent for money getting and money hoarding?

To illustrate this proposition, let us take an example. Cornelius Vanderbilt accumulated during his lifetime, it is said, $100,000,000. How much is it to be supposed that Cornelius Vanderbilt produced by the labor of his hands? It is safe to say that it would not have gone far toward making up this colossal sum. How much did he produce by the labor of his brain that really added to the world's wealth? Admit that his talent for organization was such that under his superintendence much labor was so wisely directed as to save injudicious expenditure, and that thus much of the product of labor was saved to the world's wealth; and yet is it supposable that it was through this source that he rolled up the immense fortune he left behind at his death? Suppose that such were really the case, then the moral question arises, should he and his *alone* have reaped the

result of what was saved by his wise and judicious direction, or should those benefits, save a fair, a liberal remuneration for the service he rendered, have been shared by the people at large? But it would be unprofitable to discuss further the subject from this point of view, since it is not supposable that his huge fortune was acquired in any such way. It was accumulated by so manipulating property, as it fell from time to time into his possession, that a prominent share of the aggregated reserves of earth's toilers far and near flowed spontaneously into his hands. He did not produce his fortune by the labor of his hands; he did not add this amount, or anything approximating it, to the world's wealth, by the labor of his brain; he *appropriated* it out of the reserved fund of the world's producers. He did not *steal* it outright, in the sense in which people under this system of individual property have accustomed themselves to use that word; he "appropriated" it under the legalized approval and sanction of a civilization, the elastic morals of which are in keeping with the institution of property which it maintains.

And now what further? A single individual, under this just, munificent, and humane system of property, having appropriated to his own use and behoof $100,000,000 of the earnings of a countless number of the "hewers of wood and drawers of water"—what next? Why, he dies, and leaves the bulk of his fortune to a beloved son, whose principal contribution to the world's stock of wealth has been —well, let somebody else tell. Now comes an illustration of this system of interest, which is the natural concomitant of the system of private prop-

erty. It is said that this beloved son's income, arising wholly from the use of his property, is $10,000,000 per annum. Suppose, now, he saves half that; it would then require less than a generation to double his huge fortune, besides allowing ample, I think, for luxury and waste. Think of it, you upon whom common sense has been bestowed, and tell us in the name of all that is fair, honest, and intelligent, how it is possible to prevent the earnings of the masses from floating into the hands of the few endowed with power for acquisition, any more than it is possible to prevent the rivers from flowing into the sea.

And will it be contended, then, that the bulk of the people's wealth should justly and wisely lie in such hands? If so, and if such is ever to be the drift of things, then farewell to the comfort, the prosperity, the happiness of the great mass of humanity upon the earth. Under such a decision of fitness and justice those possessing the intellectual and moral attributes of a Plato, an Aristotle, a Shakspere, or a Milton might fitly drag out a miserable existence of destitution and want, provided they possessed not also a talent for money getting and money hoarding.

Men are born and developed with a variety of talent, all of which is essential and valuable to the race, and yet few have a talent for the accumulation of property, except in a very moderate degree; and is a system of property forever to be recognized as the correct one that enables the few who have a superior fitness for its acquirement to monopolize most of the material blessings of earth, leaving the

masses to drudge on in poverty, as the inferiors of these money grabbers, their suppliants, their slaves? From the bottom of my soul I detest and abominate such a system, and, to me, the wonder of wonders is that mankind has endured it to this age of the world's civilization.

I will here define my position upon this subject of property, so that hereafter there may be no chance for mistaking what it is, should there have been heretofore. Whatever the individual produces by the labor of his hand or brain, that is in any way valuable to mankind, so far has he contributed to the world's wealth. Whatever the individual consumes or wastes beyond what he has thus produced, so far has he impoverished the world; so far has he trespassed upon others' rights; so far has he appropriated to himself that which justly belongs to others. This is excusable when, and only when, he is physically or mentally incapacitated for performing his just share of the duties of life.

Under the system of collective property which I advocate, whatever the individual produces more than he consumes would be left as an heirloom, not to family or special friends, but to the race—a free gift, after the manner in which nature supplies her bounties. And this I believe to be the broad, the benevolent, the humane spirit that must find universal acceptance among mankind before that high altitude in the world's civilization can be reached that shall insure to the race the comfort, prosperity, and happiness so ardently longed for by all. A mode of life so glorious as this being impracticable under the system of individual property, I therefore aver that

our system is founded upon a principle of injustice, and that as it cannot be justly maintained, it should be supplanted by one that can.

Now, I would not have it understood, from what has been said here, that, under the existing system of individual property, I believe it to be *morally* wrong for an individual to accept of a premium for the use of capital. I make no sanctimonious pretensions of this character. It is the system, not the individual who conforms to it, that I am combating. In truth, I think the individual would be doing himself injustice were he to allow any conscientious scruples to stand in the way of his accepting a premium for the use of his capital.

Many other important instances might be cited wherein government interferes with that with which she should not concern herself; many might also be named wherein she should take control which are now left wholly to individual and corporate management. But as the great question, What are the proper functions of a state? finds answer throughout this entire work, I shall devote no more space to it here.

To establish an entire paper currency, and to issue it for the purchase of the great public works of our land, are two among the grand purposes to be consummated in the next half century.

CHAPTER VIII.

PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION.

In the New Republic a supervision over production, and the complete management of the distribution of all products, were entrusted to the government. A general superintendent for this department, and deputies for each of the cities (distributive marts), were chosen by the House of Magistrates for the same time, and under the same rules and regulations prescribed for the officers of the bureau of public improvements. The office of the general superintendent of commerce was in the capitol building at St. Louis, and the office of the deputy superintendent in each of the cities was at Commerce Hall.

In addition to a clerical force sufficient to transact the business of his office, each deputy superintendent was assisted by a number of officers (more or less, according to the amount of business transacted) called Investigators.

The government being the purchaser and importer of all commodities brought into the republic, and managing the sale of all productions, both foreign and domestic, all articles for distribution were stored at its warehouses in the different cities, and the Investigators' duties were to keep a close watch of the stock in store of all the different wares, and report to the deputy superintendents of commerce whenever

any required replenishing. An exception to this method of storage was made in the case of articles which from their great weight or bulk were inconvenient for retaining in warehouses. Steam-engines, coal, blocks of stone, marble, etc., came under this head, and were moved directly from the place of production to their place for use.

Upon the report of the Investigators that the supply of any commodity needed replenishing, the deputy superintendent of commerce receiving such information communicated either by post or telegraph with the deputy superintendent at the foreign port or ports, inland city or cities, or to the secretary of any community or communities within his own precinct where such commodity was produced, making known his requirements. In case it was a foreign order, whenever a disengaged vessel from the port or an adjacent port, from whence the order came, was lying at the port, or any of the ports adjacent to that by which the order was received, the cargo, in case the order was sufficient to load a vessel, was quickly dispatched by her; but in case the order was not sufficient to load a vessel, she then remained until a full cargo could be secured, as no vessel was allowed to sail half empty or in ballast, as at the present time. In case of haste the cargo was sometimes forwarded by a vessel of the republic to which the order had been given, which remained upon her arrival out until a cargo could be secured for her return.

The country communities forwarded their products for market, both agricultural and mechanical, to the warehouses within the city of their own precinct.

Exceptions to this rule arose in the case of some of the principal articles for export, such as grain, cotton, etc., which were usually stored at the seaboard ports awaiting demand.

A printed list of the various commodities usually stored in the warehouses of his precinct was made by the deputy superintendent in each city, a copy of which was forwarded to each deputy superintendent of commerce in each city of the globe, also to each of the communities of his own precinct. Each community was kept constantly advised by the deputy superintendent of commerce in their precinct of the stock in store, whether large, small, or medium, of the article or articles of their particular manufacture, and the demand for the same. The production was then increased or diminished in accordance, and in case of the demand for any particular commodity exceeding the facilities for production, the facilities were extended by introducing its manufacture into other communities.

Agricultural production was also regulated so far as practicable by a similar proceeding, and it was the requirements of the people that determined the production both agricultural and mechanical.

The price of all commodities was fixed as near as could be calculated, by the producer, upon the cost of production. Each distributive mart, or city, had also three arbiters, appointed by the deputy superintendent of commerce for the purpose of adjusting any question of difference which might arise in the fixing of prices.

A charge to cover the cost of transportation, both of individuals and freight, and a commission to cover

the privilege of exacting a premium for the use of lands and other property still remained, it would cause a complete deadlock of things at once. Those holding property from which an income could be derived would be unwilling to exchange it for money, which would bring in no income whatever. Moreover, if the use of whatever is wholly my own is wanted by another, I have the natural and legitimate right to demand whatever premium I may desire for its use, it being at the option of the other to take it at my price or not at all; and the public has no legitimate right to interfere. Such laws, therefore, as we have in our own and other countries, restricting the amount of premium or interest to be paid for the use of money, are clearly as much an infringement upon the rights of the individual as would be laws restricting the amount of rent which should be received for the use of a house or other property. If I am the owner of a house worth $20,000, I am not restricted as to what rent I may exact for the use of it. Were I to sell the house, receiving $20,000 in consideration, why, then, any more, should I be restricted from exacting such a premium as I may demand for the use of the money received in payment for the house? Another objection of the strongest character to any legal regulation of the premium to be paid or received for the use of money, is its impotence, or futility, it being well known and often pointed out that under such laws a higher premium is likely to be obtained than where no laws of the kind exist. And so upon examination we see it is plain that the right of individual property once granted, no restriction whatever can rightfully or

effectually be put upon the holders thereof, as to what premium they may exact for the use of it, whether it consists of real property, or money, its representative.

Exacting a high rate of interest for money is often objected to, also, upon moral grounds; but I fail to see the difference, morally, between exacting an excessive rate of interest for the use of money which is the representative of property, or an excessive premium or rent for the use of the property itself, a matter which no moralist ever attempts to call in question. But while justice and good sense must accord to the individual full control over what society has declared to be absolutely his own, we find that acting upon this decision is sure to lead to results the most deplorable. And herein lies one reason, to my mind the most overpowering, why the system of individual property should be abolished. Under the *regime* of private property, the able in the art of money getting—the acute, the shrewd, the sharp, the unscrupulous *few*—have provided for them, in this matter of interest or a premium for the use of money, a means whereby they may gather into their hands the accumulated reserves of the toiling millions with a power as irresistible as that by which the great Norwegian maelstrom draws down into its vortex whatever may venture within the circle of its influence. A beginning once made, a little capital once accumulated, and then, like the boy's ball of damp, fresh snow, that gains size as it is rolled along until it rises into a thing of huge proportions, the accumulations of the able and the shrewd gather to themselves, by means of premiums exacted for the

the expense of disposing of all commodities, was made by the government. Accounts were made up quarterly, and a remittance made for the payment of all commodities after deducting freights and commissions. Each community purchased all supplies required in the city of their own precinct. The intent was to afford each community, so far as practicable, equal privileges in the disposal of their productions, thereby insuring to each equal opportunity for success.

It may be regarded as presumptuous to have attempted outlining in a few pages, as has been done here, a general plan, and that so simple, for the accomplishment of purposes so vast; yet the question is not one of simplicity or of elaborateness and complexity; but it is whether the plan would work successfully under a system of collective property, as it is not pretended that it would under the existing property system.

Let it be examined, and the decision rendered with all candor whether the structure of our system for production and distribution of products, based as it is upon a foundation of collective property, is equal to the purpose for which it is designed, or beyond the reach of human possibilities. I may have overlooked in the construction some important element that would be necessary to complete the system and put it in running order; but it does seem to me that the outline here given bears assurance on its face that the system I have marked out might be found eminently practicable under the conditions for which it is intended. Admitting such to be the case, the magnitude of the benefits which would accrue to

mankind through the change it contemplates would be simply incalculable.

Simple as is the system briefly outlined here, in the New Republic it had been equal to the blending of mankind together in unity for the accomplishment of a grand and noble purpose, and that purpose no less than to provide amply, even lavishly, for all the wants of man's animal nature. The art of providing for these wants was no longer left to blind chance—to isolated individual, and therefore, in the great majority of cases, to *impotent* effort—but it had been reduced to a system in which there was forethought, well-devised and well-regulated mutual plans in preparing for, as well as harmony and combined action for securing, its accomplishment.

I shall defer giving any further particulars of the workings of the new system for a subsequent chapter; my further object in this being to point out the *disadvantages, the enormous waste, and the terrible injustice of the existing competitive system*—or, rather, the blind chance effort, as there is no system about it. As stated in a former chapter, I regard this blind, headlong, reckless, haphazard rush forward, upon the individual competitive plan, as the most serious, the most injurious, the most pernicious feature, in the economy of human affairs, and it is in the matter of production and distribution, more than all others, that its evils become apparent.

It will be noticed that the system herein outlined effects an organization and arrangement for regulating the supply of all products to the demand. An incalculable evil of our existing competitive system of production and distribution lies in the fact that

under it there is not, nor can there be, any way devised for doing this. Every manufacturer must "go it blind" as to whether there may not already be in the country, of the very article he is producing, a stock sufficient to supply the normal demand for a score of years to come. And all do "go it blind," trusting to their wit, skill, energy, or impudence, for crowding their wares off, whether required or not. As we shall soon see, the chances usually are that there is already a surfeit of their wares stowed away upon the shelves of millions of distributors that have really no legitimate call for their occupation.

Let us now make a brief examination of our present methods of production and distribution, with a view to discovering their adequacy to the public requirements. The system I have brought forward assumes an intelligent supervision over all productions; though it is presumed that this could be made more complete and effective over manufactures than over the products of agriculture. The latter, depending so much upon the vicissitudes of nature which man has not the knowledge or power to control, cannot be conducted with the precision of mechanical production; and yet this does not prove that intelligent supervision, in a general way, of the agricultural productions of a country may not be found exceedingly beneficial.

Employing the means of ascertaining at any time what is approximately the quantity in store of the principal cereals, and ascertaining also from advices and statistics the probable foreign demand, an intelligent judgment could be formed of vast benefit in determining the acreage to be devoted to any par-

ticular production. Surplus of some cereals and scarcity of others might thus be prevented to a great extent. Overproduction in agriculture, however, does not cause a waste equal to that which is caused when there is overproduction in manufactures; because if an article of food is scare, and, therefore, dear, while another is abundant and cheap, people, as well as domestic animals, may often accommodate themselves to the use of the latter. It is a general underproduction, therefore, more than overproduction, that is to be feared in agriculture. More especially will this be true so long as the calling continues as unpopular as now; which, again, must continue so long as the system of isolated farming remains in vogue, and a miserable pittance is all that is afforded the farmer for his drudgery.

Whether the fruits of agriculture are now produced in quantities sufficient to satisfy the wants of all mankind, is a question not easily solved. That many go hungry is certain; but that many others revel in abundance, and destroy or waste more than they consume, is no less true. It cannot be determined, therefore, whether by an equal distribution the present production would or would not be adequate to the wants of the entire people. If, however, the total production be equal to the total want, nothing is more clear than that it is effected by excessive and unreasonable toil on the part of the agricultural community. From "early morn till dewy eve," the farmer toils, and if we have not now in the aggregate an excessive agricultural production, then it is plain that the number engaged in farming is smaller than it should be.

The present hours of labor of the average farmer should be reduced at least one-third, and in a well ordered system of industry there is no questioning that they might be reduced one-half.

What, then, has put matters so out of joint? The causes are various, and many of them have already been alluded to in these pages; but those most important are *excessive capital and the excessive labor now employed in mechanical production and in distribution in general, as well as excessive importation.* Let us consider briefly this proposition. After a depression protracted for a term of years had closed the doors of many of our manufacturing establishments, and caused the remainder to run on short time, besides tying an indefinite number of vessels up to their wharves, what may we now behold? From this continued depression, and a consequent check of manufacture and importation, the stock of manufactured wares had no doubt become in some measure depleted; and from a trifling demand thus arising, the result is that at this hour of writing the capacious stores and warehouses in our principal seaports, as well as those in many inland cities, are crammed to bursting with foreign wares, while an untold number of vessels are on the seas laden with cargoes to be added to this redundance; and, still further to swell this prodigious superfluity, we have, scattered all over the land, in rude hovel and in palatial structure, in numbers many times in excess of the normal demand for them, stores and warehouses full to repletion with both foreign and domestic mechanical products, piled up for moth, rust, dirt, and vermin to destroy, or to be rendered

useless by that still more destructive factor, the mandate of fashion. There is little room for doubt that upon an average the overplus of both foreign and domestic manufactured articles in this country to-day is sufficient for the requirements of the people for a decade; while, for the above stated and other reasons, a great portion of these, never being put to practical use, will be virtually sacrificed.

What, then, does this demonstrate but that mechanical production is everywhere overdone, as it will continue to be overdone so long as the *manufacturing facilities*, both in this country and in Europe, remain in excess of the normal demand for them? In the United States, at least, these facilities are so far disproportioned to the demand for their products that hardly an article which is manufactured may not be produced in quantities from two to five times greater than are normally required; and all over the land stand huge factories, erected and supplied with machinery at an immense cost, which, while turning out but a fraction of what they are equal to producing, still glut the market with their unneeded wares.

And there is another consideration involved in this matter, of such moment as to call for our attention here. It is this: as soon as a trifling demand arises, these factories put on all the help they can muster, drive ahead pell-mell, and after a few months of a rush of business the country is again so overstocked with their wares, that back they must come once more upon "half-time." The effect upon the employees of this shuttle-cock sort of industry is most deplorable, and while the greater number find employment but for about half their time, many others

constantly wait, like Micawber, for something to turn up. "Half-time!" as the matter now goes, the laborer having need for full employment to provide for his family—I abominate it. I would delight to see the hours of the mechanic shortened, as well as those of the farmer, but half-time and half-pay are the ruin of both. But the manufacturers will tell you that it is the best they can do; they cannot run full time without vastly overstocking, and it is better to reduce the hours than to close up their factories a portion of the time and run the risk of getting their employees back again when wanted. As business is now run, no doubt this is true; but, as the frog in the fable said to the boys who were stoning him, "It may be sport to you, but it is death to me." So it is death for the poor workman, particularly if he has a family depending on him for support, and his wages, when fully employed, are no more than adequate to a comfortable existence.

The truth is, some way should be devised to so restrict manufacturing facilities that when run up to the utmost limit of capacity their productions would not far exceed the normal demand. Such a system, I have no doubt, would let loose at least one-half the numbers at present employed, or half-employed, in factories, and put them where they properly belong, to wit, to cultivating and embellishing the earth. At present, manufacturing ventures are often a game of hazard bordering for uncertainty on the Stock Exchange or the roulette table. Men are every day engaging in new enterprises for the production of such wares as the country is overstocked with, and for manufacturing which the facilities are already

trebly abundant beyond all necessity for them. These men rarely stop to consider the facts of the case, but rush in, hoping to win by chance or their ability to thrust aside those already engaged in the enterprise. I hold that in all such haphazard ventures both the capital and the labor employed are virtually sacrificed; and, what is worse, a positive wrong is committed toward those already engaged in similar pursuits. This is the great age of invention and mechanical improvements, and the introduction of labor-saving machinery should have had the effect of turning millions from mechanical to agricultural pursuits, or, if not needed there, to the construction of public improvements and the embellishment of the earth; but such has not been the case. Instead, this surplus horde hang about the manufacturing establishments, working on half-time and drawing half-pay, the sufferers from the very inventions which, admirable as they are, add not a jot to the world's wealth or the people's comfort and happiness.

Such are a few of the disastrous effects of competition; and yet ninety-nine men out of every hundred will tell us that competition is the saving grace in economics—an incalculable blessing which we could not get along without. It produces "cheapness," they say. But does it? I know this is the almost universal belief, but it seems to me that as a fact it is at least questionable. Cheapness as compared with what? I ask. Why, the cheapness of competition as compared with monopoly, of course, is the reply. Now, it little concerns my position whether competition, as against monopoly, does or does not produce cheapness, as what I am chiefly concerned

in showing is the necessity of a new order of things, in which there shall be neither competition nor monopoly. Nevertheless there is, I think, considerable doubt as to whether competition has at present any advantage over monopoly as regards cheapness. The monopoly of an article, it is true, places its cost to the consumer in the hands of the holder or holders. But monopoly has this merit, that where a monopoly of any mechanical production exists there is usually little *waste*, while under active competition the waste is usually enormous. And this waste, as we shall soon see, is added to the cost of the commodity to the consumer. Whether, then, the cupidity of the producers of a monopolized commodity would prompt them to fix such a price upon it as would more than cover the *waste* in its production under competition is, of course, a difficult question to answer, and yet it is worthy of consideration.

The assertion that overproduction, like underproduction, enhances the cost of commodities to the consumer may appear somewhat startling, yet it is unquestionably true. Overproduction increases the cost of mechanical productions by locking up the great overplus of capital invested in the facilities necessary to overproduction, as well as by locking up capital to carry the excess of manufactured wares.

Our manufacturing facilities are, on the average, probably thrice as great as the call for their products demands. We see, then, how this works to enhance the cost of productions to the consumer. In not a few cases where the facilities are beyond the requirements, buildings, machinery, etc., remain wholly idle; the buildings to rot and tumble down, the machinery

to rust and become useless. I shall not claim that this enhances the prices of the commodity in the manufacture of which this capital has been sunk, and I mention it here in passing merely to point out one more source of waste under haphazard adventure upon the individual plan. Capital thus invested is wholly lost to the world.

Again, a still larger amount of capital which is locked up in mechanical production, though not wholly idle, is virtually useless; and upon this the consumer has to pay a round interest by reason of the increased cost of commodities. This is perfectly plain. The manufacturer, in fixing prices upon his wares, provides for such a ratio of profit upon his estimated sales as will yield him, besides his current expenses and an equivalent for his own services, a handsome interest, or dividend, upon capital invested. It is the same, even though a large portion of such investment lies in excessive outfit, say in real estate, machinery and implements, half of which may never be in use, and the other half in use perhaps for only a portion of the time. He also provides for covering interest on any excess of stock which he may be carrying in warehouse or store. This is a law of trade that, if he would be successful, the business man cannot ignore. Some may violate it, but they will soon find themselves at the end of their rope. Manufacturers and merchants who thrive—and of course it is only such who continue in business, and by whom most of our wares are made and sold—must adopt this rule; and the result is that the consumers must pay for all the expenses of competition involved in overproduction of goods, overpro-

duction of the facilities for manufacturing them, and the interest on the capital invested in the overproduction of both. And so as overproduction by producing *waste*, and underproduction by producing *monopoly*, have the effect to enhance the price of the manufactured article to the consumer, we may see the necessity of devising some system to adjust the supply of all mechanical productions as closely as possible to the demand.

This same law of trade which obliges the consumer to pay in the end for all superfluous investment applies to distribution as well as to production; and the waste in distribution is even greater than in production. In all our cities and villages over the land are structures for distributing our wares ranging in dimensions and cost from the towering edifice of iron, marble, granite, or brick, down through every grade, to the hovel in which old clothes and other cast-off wares are held for sale.

Past all computation or comprehension is the amount of capital now sunk in superfluous outfit for distributing the products of nature and art—superfluous, I call it, from the fact that under a well devised and intelligent system of distribution the purpose could be far better served with but a mere fraction of the present outlay; and a redundance of stores means a redundance of commodities to fill them to make something like a respectable show. Herein we find the principal outlet for the overproduction we have just been regarding, and we may now begin to catch a faint glimmer of its magnitude. And yet the waste lies not only in the capital sunk in superfluous structures and wares for filling them, but

also in the number of individuals, which the superfluities themselves make it neccesssary to employ at enormous expense to conduct the business. There is hardly a doubt that under a well organized system of distribution nineteen out of every twenty of those now engaged in commercial pursuits might be released, to turn their attention to agriculture, or to such improvements of the earth as would be beneficial to the race. To illlustrate, let us take for example what may be seen in almost every village, to wit: three or four stores, where one would be ample for all the requirements of the people. Each of these four stores has a separate building in which to conduct business, which is well filled with the various commodities required by the community; and, besides the proprietor, there must be clerks sufficient to attend the patrons.

Now suppose that in place of the four stores, we have but *one*—in place of the *four* buildings, we have but *one*—which would need to be but a trifle more capacious, probably, than either of the four, for the chances are that any one of these is carrying about as much stock as the community needs. We get rid, then, of three buildings; of three stocks of goods almost equal to the stock retained in the remaining store; three proprietors, and, without doubt, one-half or more of the clerks that were employed in the four establishments. Here, now, we get a pretty large saving, and the more stores, or distributive establishments, there are in a place to be combined under one roof, or similarly combined under several, the greater the saving. Having now the whole custom of the community, at how much less the proprie-

tor of one store could afford to sell his wares than when the custom was divided up among four! I do not say that he *would*, but I do say that he could afford to sell at much reduced prices.

Now, reader, I am of the opinion that a community really does pay higher prices for their wares the greater the competition is, providing that competition remains permanent. For a time, perhaps, when an opposition store is first set up, active competition may cause a cut in prices; but if there is capital behind the new comer, and if it is seen that he has come to stay, very low prices are not of long duration. The situation soon resolves itself into this, that the new competitor has drawn a share of the patronage from each of the other stores, and now each, if all continue in business, must find a reduced sale for their wares. The result is that, obeying the laws of trade before stated, prices are enhanced rather than diminished. Each expects to live by his business; hence if sales are small, prices must necessarily be high. Though perhaps done tacitly, it is upon the same principle that the officials of four competitive railway lines existing where two would answer as well, get together and fix upon prices for transportation which allow them all to thrive. To lay down a general principle in a word, capital expended in any enterprise whatever beyond its normal requirements produces a *waste* which must be met with enhanced prices imposed upon the community at large.

But the chief purpose of the writer, I repeat, is not to attempt to show whether the cupidity of monopoly or the waste of competition is the more burdensome

to the people, but to show the practicability and value of a system that would obviate both these evils. Whether or not the reader be of the opinion that competition as against monopoly is a promoter of cheapness, I think that from what has now been said he cannot fail to see that there is an enormous and incalculable *waste* in our competitive efforts to carry on production and distribution, and that that waste must be borne by the consumers.

Another evil of much importance, which can neither be eliminated nor mitigated to any considerable extent under our existing method of competitive mechanical production, is the practice of making and putting upon sale inferior and often the most worthless goods. The amount of material and labor sacrificed in this way is beyond all manner of conjecture. This class of goods are often as attractive in appearance as are those of a really durable make; but when in the hands of the consumers, they hardly offer an equivalent for the time spent in their purchase and arrangement for use. They are the dearest goods purchased, and yet from their apparent cheapness they are largely bought, and bought oftenest, too, by those who can least afford to spend their money uselessly. Nor is the manufacture of these goods confined to the knaves, as is often supposed, but by this incorrigible competition nearly all manufacturers find themselves driven to the manufacture of them. It might be thought that the public would eventually be led to discriminate against cheap and worthless wares, but this is by no means the case, and never will be to any large extent, for the simple reasons that they are attractive in appearance, low in

price, and, moreover, usually afford the dealer a better profit than those of a more durable make. Hence they will always be crowded upon the market.

Then, again, there is the adulteration of products, which is almost universally carried on, which is even more pernicious than the manufacture of inferior wares, and which can never be eliminated or diminished under our competitive system. The losses thus imposed upon the community are enormous, while in the same way health and life are in constant jeopardy.

This matter of *waste* and of the enormous sacrifice of labor, consequent upon the lack of anything which may be properly called an industrial system, is one of such transcendent importance that I would have it deeply impressed upon the mind of the reader; and yet enough, it would seem, has now been said in this and in former chapters to make any further elaboration of the subject uncalled for here. Having studied this matter closely, and reflected much upon it, I am strongly of the opinion that the larger portion—I have sometimes thought nine-tenths, even—of the entire labor of man's hands, is virtually sacrificed by the lack of a well-devised, world-wide system to guide him in providing for his animal wants. Let the reader consider well this prodigious, this incalculable, this almost incomprehensible *waste*, consequent upon conducting matters upon the individual, competitive plan, and I hardly think that he will regard as excessive the estimate of labor sacrificed which I have given here. As I have already said, our planet is no niggard, but yields exuberantly of its bounties for the maintenance of all

animal life upon its surface; and were it not for the enormous waste consequent upon a lack of a well-devised system in the production and distribution of commodities, as well as in the industrial organization generally, the labor of men's hands and brains as now expended would soon fill the world to redundance with both the comforts and luxuries of life.

To fully realize the prodigious extravagance of our competitive mode of production and distribution, it is necessary to compare it with some ideal system which is clearly within the scope of human possibilities—a system through which the requirements of the people all over the world may at any time be quite definitely known, and under which mechanical production, and to a great extent agricultural production also, may be so regulated to respond to these wants that there shall be neither over- nor under-production to any considerable extent—a system, moreover, under which the cost of distribution in general would be but a mere bagatelle compared with what it is under our present competitive lack of system.

Let us now glance at the effect which competition has upon *character*—upon the *morals* of the people. The natural outgrowth of the system of private property is competition, and competition, too, in the lowest, meanest, and most depraved form—not competition in the endeavor to benefit the race, but to benefit self at the expense of the race by so managing as to appropriate what others have produced or in some manner acquired.

Before regarding this subject of competition in its direct bearing, however, upon the individual in

trade, from a moral point of view, let us for a moment trace out some of the moral evils arising from our existing systems of property, which may not be termed, perhaps, as strictly competitive. Let us suppose that from some natural cause, the crops of a country have failed, and the resources of its people have become depleted to an extent causing much distress, while in another land crops are ample, and grain elevators and warehouses are groaning beneath the weight of a surplus production. What say the people of the favored land now, in view of these circumstances? Do they say, "Now that we have been favored with exuberant crops we must send our products out to this distressed people at prices that are much lower than the usual average?" Not a bit of it. Such a humanitarian doctrine is too weak, sentimental, and contemptible for the average human being, educated under the benign influences of the system of private property. No, no; now is the time, they say, to take advantage of their necessities, and profit by the distress of these miserable foreigners. Go about among the farmers, the manufacturers, the mechanics, the merchants, the shippers, in a word, the entire people, when the crops in their own country have been gathered in abundance, and news comes of short crops and great depletion in foreign lands, which must bring a large demand for their surplus products, and you will see the happiest body of people that your eyes ever beheld. How jubilant they are, and with what fervor they clasp hands and congratulate each other over the good time coming and near at hand, when everything will go booming

up in consequence of these foreign wants. I have heard men who were reputed good, respectable citizens, even members of Christian churches, express great delight upon reading the news of a foreign war that had just broken out, thinking it would have the effect to advance prices and make business prosperous in their own country. As regards prices, in such a case as I have cited above, everybody knows that the custom is for each and all to take the advantage of the situation for making every dollar out of it they possibly can.

The farmer, refusing to sell except at a great advance, crowds prices up to the highest possible limit he can hope to obtain; transportation companies increase their rates of freight, and speculators (the worst of all) buy in surplus products, and manipulate the market to realize prices the most exorbitant. And so a whole community of Shylocks, without hesitation or scruple, take the advantage of their necessities to extract from an unfortunate, distressed people the last pound of flesh, and drink of their very life's blood.

It may be maintained that this is an unfair statement, and *charities* may be brought forward in extenuation of the charge of Shylockism, or as a complete offset to it. A mitigation this may be, but hardly a justification of acts so inhuman and heinous. In the first place, charities are rarely extended until a people have become so impoverished that they have little or nothing left to buy with and are dying from starvation; when the last pound of flesh has literally wasted from their bones and water has taken the place of blood. So long as they can pay, the motto

is, "Bleed them as effectually as possible." And so, what is the value, or wherein lies the humanity, of charities extended to people under such circumstances? First compel them to pay a double price for the food they are obliged to obtain from you, and when this can be done no longer, then dole out a miserable pittance which you would dignify under the name of charity!

And now let us see how competition affects *character*, under the existing system of property. Although there are, no doubt, exceptions, it is well known that, as a rule, "two of a trade can never agree." And why is this except for a clashing of self-interests? except that the almighty dollar steps in between?

Two professional men, or merchants, may be the best of friends when at a distance from each other, but bring them into such close proximity that in what they have to sell (be it professional service, or products of any kind) they commence to compete for the patronage of the community, and differences immediately arise. They may be discreet enough to hide their jealousies and animosities partly—wholly, perhaps—but rest assured there is a latent feeling lurking there that rejoices not in the success of the rival.

And is it not natural enough that a feeling of such a character should arise? I have established myself, I will say, in some country village, either as a physician, lawyer, merchant, or mechanic, and the requirements of my special calling are barely sufficient for the support of my family; or if the village is large, there may be several following the same calling as myself who have already crowded the sup-

ply so far beyond the legitimate wants as to afford but a meager support to each; and now a rival, or two or three of them, come in with skill, capital, and ability to compete further for the patronage of the community. Before, I could hardly see my way clear for feeding, clothing, and educating those dependent upon me, which is the supreme object to which my life is devoted, and in comes this rival, or these rivals, now, which means either that my children must be stinted in food, scantily clothed, with extremely limited advantages for an education, or that I must become a dishonest man and cheat my creditors, or in some other nefarious way provide what I am now by reason of this competition unable to provide honestly. By the rules of trade and the customs of society, the rival has rights there equal with my own, and is heartily welcomed, no doubt, by the community, under the prevailing opinion that competition makes things cheap; but would I not be more than human, let me ask, if under such circumstances I did not wish the interloper, with his brief, his physics, or his gimcracks, in Guinea or heaven?

There is no use mincing the matter, or making any sanctimonious pretensions to the contrary. Competition in trade has the direct effect of setting the heart of every individual against his rival, and of causing an enmity more or less bitter according as individual interests may be affected. And how ingenious, crafty, and iniquitous are the many stratagems resorted to to get the best of rivals! The policy of the more wary and astute is often to endeavor, through a feigned semblance of friend-

ship, to entrap his rival by gaining his confidence and dexterously causing him, in an unguarded moment, to utter such language, or commit himself in such a manner, as shall prove injurious to himself and beneficial to his antagonist. The game of pump for the mastery, resorted to in such cases as these, would be often amusing if it were not diabolical. Over a bottle of wine, or whisky, a couple of men sit down for a tilt, with the design on the part of one or both to outwit the rival, that each may gain something for his special advantage; and many is the thrust given, and deftly parried, until the potations have become too deep for one, when the steadier nerve and more level head usually win the game.

Another common recourse among rivals is to seek to build themselves up by injuring their competitors —among professional men by blasting reputation for character or competency; among merchants and manufacturers, by seeking to injure credit, or misrepresent and undervalue the quality of goods. Such are a few of the tricks out of the many that are resorted to by rival competitors to gain an advantage over their opponents for their own benefit. And so it will be seen that the natural result of our competitive system is to make enemies of all who are engaged in the same calling.

Again, from him who has a tin whistle to him who has a railway to dispose of, there is a direct and powerful inducement to misrepresent, hoodwink, deceive, and lie. These detestable characteristics arise as spontaneously out of our system of property and individual competition as fleas from a heap of rotten compost; nor are they confined to the *mer-*

chant, as is sometimes intimated, though in his occupation he may be oftener called upon to practice a sort of double-dealing duplicity; but they prevail and abound among all classes of professions and callings wherein there may be anything whatever of which the possessor is desirous to dispose. To obtain the most for whatever one has to dispose of, and thus increase individual wealth, is the chief instigator of this category of contemptible wrongs. Go further and we shall find that the common result of this fierce and relentless competition is despair and crime; and these often in forms the most hideous, desperate, and appalling.

In such a game of quits, the weaker must inevitably go to the wall. The able in body or brain, and more particularly the latter, will prevail over the weaker, driving them to despair and often to death; and were the weaker but the *few*, the result would be less deplorable, as there would be less to suffer; but on the contrary those who are driven to the wall are the major portion of those who engage in the contest. Let any one who had an extensive acquaintance among the merchants of New York twenty years ago look around him and see what has become of those whom he was personally acquainted with at that time. But a fraction of these will he find in business here to-day. A few there are living in splendor and counting fabulous wealth; others have secured a competency and are living in comfort; another fraction have found the struggle too severe, and have removed to the country; a few more are still struggling on, barely maintaining a livelihood. But what has become of the rest, who were

probably nine-tenths of the whole? They have failed ingloriously; they have been crowded to the wall. Take a little pains to inquire into their history, and you will be shocked at their wreck and ruin. Many went on apparently prosperous for a time, but they were not equal to the emergency; disaster came, and they sank beneath the weight of their misfortunes; failure drove them to despair, and despair to intemperance, debauchery, and squalor, while the last, perhaps, drove them to insanity, suicide, or a premature death in some form.

Others, again, who were forced to succumb to their disastrous fate, are still dragging out wretched lives as gamblers, forgers, swindlers, gutter-loafers, and quite likely some as thieves, highwaymen, burglars, and cut-throats. Go to the bottom; trace out the history of these individuals, and you will find that the primary cause of all this wreck and ruin has been, almost invariably, a discouragement that has driven to despair arising from an incompetency to cope with rivals in this terrible, relentless, life-destroying, *competitive struggle*. We hear of men not succeeding in business on account of intemperance. Reverse this, and say that they have become intemperate from inability to succeed in the desperate competitive struggle before them, and you will hit nearer the truth in most cases.

But intemperance is but one of a thousand evils to which this ferocious competition leads, when it has driven its victim to despair. Thus reduced, men become indifferent, reckless, lose self-respect, are regardless of the opinion of others, and when it has reached this state, they are fit for any crime that

belongs to the species. Men are often called "lazy" who are simply discouraged! Time and time again have they set out with the resolve to do and to be; to work, to save, to amass a fortune; but through a series of misfortunes, or lacking the natural endowment for success, they have been baffléd at every turn, and sink back at last into indifference or despair.

Shall we say, then, that those who are so unfortunate as to meet with disaster, or lack the ability for success in the art of money getting and money hoarding, deserve the fate that awaits them under the present system of property and ruthless competition—deserve to be trodden under foot like dogs, and to lie in a corner and snap at the bone which is tossed to them by the more favored of their race? But, you say, they lack "*pluck*," and should keep on trying—should never give up. This is good advice, and worthy of being followed to the letter; we should all, no doubt, make the most of our circumstances, and do the best we can; but I want to say to you, man, so ready always with your advice, the chances are that you yourself have but little of the pluck you are so quick to recommend.

You have been successful, perhaps, commencing at the bottom of the ladder and working your way up until you have reached the top, and amassed a fortune. Well, if you have done this, you have been in some way favored beyond the common lot. The force of circumstances has carried you, probably, into some business to which you were naturally adapted, and nature has endowed you with the requisites of success in the art of money getting and saving; but, for

all this, millions of laborers now toiling for their daily bread may discount you in this very quality of pluck. Ignorant and degraded, unfavored by circumstances that naturally lead to success, or without the ability to profit by them if so favored, many have toiled on from month to month, and year to year, from early youth until their white locks blossom for the grave, for the mere pittance which their labor has secured to them, and out of which must be supported families whom they love as well as you love yours.

Think of parents seeing their children scantily fed and clothed, without the means of education, or of dressing them decently to send to the public schools; miserably housed, without comforts, without amusements; in short, with little that makes life worth living, and then let them turn their eyes upon your elegant mansion, your wife and children dressed in the height of fashion and bedecked with jewels; your magnificent studs and gay equipage; your big dinners; your parties and amusements; your country seat, with all its luxuries; your opportunity for travel and recreation; and then when they have dwelt long upon these scenes, as you need not doubt these poor toilers often do, and feeling, too, that there must be a wrong somewhere; see them still plodding incessantly on, striving to do the best in their power for those dependent on them, and then tell me, sir, what you know about *pluck*. To me the most sublime and striking monuments of *courage* upon the face of the globe are men and women like these. Your Alexanders, Cæsars, Napoleons, and Grants sink into insignificance when compared with them.

Under our system of property and competition the custom has grown up of grading our vices; thus, lying and stealing are considered the thing for the outcasts, while the more refined qualities of vice, such as duplicity, deceit, cheating, and indirect appropriation, are for the more respectable, the kid-gloved members of society. To demand and receive double the value of an article is not regarded as dishonorable, but, on the contrary, is thought to be rather a smart operation in the seller; and, to accomplish this, duplicity and deceit are privileges sanctioned by public opinion. So prevalent and universal has this respectable habit of cheating become, that if you will show me a son who will not cheat his own father (in a horse trade, at all events), I will show you a prodigy. And he is likely to be the worse duped of all who pins his faith upon the honor of an individual from the fact of his having subscribed to some creed or form of religious belief. Highly sanctimonious venders feel that they have been very honorable and performed their whole duty if they have told no lies in their endeavor to dispose of their property. They do not feel that they are in any wise called upon to state the *defects* of what they may have for sale. This is a matter which the buyer is left to find out, if he can; but rest assured he does not often get any help in that direction from the party wishing to dispose of the defective article. So if the seller can obtain twice the value of the article by omitting to state its defects, he puts the extortion in his pocket. He is at ease with himself, and probably chuckles inwardly over his success; feeling the assurance that the course he has taken

was the same that probably would have been pursued by the buyer of the article himself, or most of his fellow-beings, for that matter, under similar circumstances. He knows, further, that his course, execrable as it is, is in full harmony with the spirit and practice of the age.

Monstrous beyond measure is the seemingly current public opinion upon matters of this character. A man steals a dollar, and he is imprisoned and disgraced; he robs others of hundreds of thousands or millions by his duplicity, falsehood, cheating and swindling, and he is called "clever," fills some of the highest offices in government, occupies the choicest pew in church, lives in luxury and splendor, caressed and honored by society; in short, he is the big mogul around whom the obsequious minions of a false civilization truckle and fawn.

Then, again, there is Bankruptcy, which, under our existing property and credit systems, is a constant *bid for crime.* It is well known that the road to wealth lies through the indirect appropriation of what others have produced; hence the more ambitious are not likely to drudge on in the slow and servile employments of manual labor, to be shorn of their earnings through the machinations of others, but prefer being shearers rather than the shorn. These, therefore, resort to the channels of trade, of manufacture, and to other pursuits whereby they hope to attain their object. Many of them, no doubt, first make what they regard as an honest effort to obtain success, but, driven to the wall, they resort at last to the bankruptcy swindle, while others again, and many, too, embark in such adventures with little hope or desire

of success in a legitimate way, knowing that they can secure a competency quicker and easier through the bankruptcy strategy. Then the unfortunate part of this matter is that no laws which ever have been, or ever can be devised, have been or will be adequate for protecting the honest bankrupt without affording opportunity for these bankrupt swindlers.

The spoliation of this sort carried out under our late Bankrupt act was truly outrageous. The facilities for evading the payment of just debts, as well as any criminal responsibility for the spiriting away and concealing of property, were so perfect under this act, and the dividends so meager when passing through the usual course, that manufacturers and merchants finally adopted, as a rule, the policy of taking whatever the bankrupt might offer, giving a receipt in full and asking few questions.

Look now, reader, over the list of evils (a few of the more important only of which I have given space for in this chapter) which arise spontaneously out of our individual property system, with its free and unchecked competition, and you will behold an array of vice and crime sufficient to make the angels weep if such beings there are. And the attempt to eradicate these evils under the system which has generated them, would prove as futile as the attempt to pump the ocean dry. Some of them might to a certain extent be mitigated, but this would be merely the patching up of a rotten old structure that, if it ever had a day of usefulness, has long since passed it. I confess that I have little patience with an age, possessing the intelligence and experience of the present, that is content to sit with folded arms and gaze

serenely upon a commercial system that generates and sanctions such evils as have been pointed out in this chapter.

There is but one remedy that I can discover for these evils, and that is to substitute for competition a system that does not naturally propagate such follies inequalities, waste, and wrongs; in other words, a system in which the interest of one shall be the interest of all; an intelligent system of collective interests controlled and operated by the people at large.

I append to this chapter the quotations from Louis Blanc, made by John Stuart Mill in his notable Chapters upon Socialism in the February number of the "Fortnightly Review" for 1879 (since republished in book form under the title of "Socialism and Utilitarianism," pp. 37–45), and which drew from him the remark that "it is impossible to deny that they make out a frightful case either against the existing order of society, or against the position of man himself in the world:"

Competition is for the people a system of extermination. Is the poor man a member of society, or an enemy to it? We ask for an answer. All around him he finds the soil preoccupied Can he cultivate the earth for himself? No; for the right of the first occupant has become a right of property. Can he gather the fruits which the hand of God ripens on the path of man? No; for, like the soil, the fruits have been *appropriated*. Can he hunt or fish? No; for that is a right which is dependent upon the government. Can he draw water from a spring inclosed in a field? No; for the proprietor of the field is, in virtue of his right to the field, proprietor of the fountain. Can he, dying of hunger and thirst, stretch out his hand for the charity of his fellow-creatures? No; for there are laws against begging. Can he, exhausted by fatigue and without a refuge, lie down to sleep upon the pavement of the streets? No; for there are laws against vagabondage. Can he, flying from the cruel

native land where everything is denied him, seek the means of living far from the place where life was given him? No; for it is not permitted to change your country except on certain conditions which the poor man cannot fulfil.

What, then, can the unhappy man do? He will say, "I have hands to work with, I have intelligence, I have youth, I have strength; take all this, and in return give me a morsel of bread." This is what the workingmen do say. But even here the poor man may be answered, "I have no work to give you." What is he to do then?

* * * * * *

What is competition from the point of view of the workman? It is work put up to auction. A contractor wants a workman: three present themselves. How much for your work?—Half-a-crown: I have a wife and children.—Well; and how much for yours?—Two shillings: I have no children, but I have a wife.—Very well; and now how much for you?—One and eightpence are enough for me: I am single. Then you shall have the work. It is done; the bargain is struck. And what are the other two workmen to do? It is to be hoped they will die quietly of hunger. But what if they take to thieving? Never fear; we have the police. To murder? We have got the hangman. As for the lucky one, his triumph is only temporary. Let a fourth workman make his appearance, strong enough to fast every other day, and his price will run down still lower; then there will be a new outcast—a new recruit for the prison, perhaps.

Will it be said that these melancholy results are exaggerated; that at all events they are only possible when there is not work enough for the hands that seek employment? But I ask, in answer, Does the principle of competition contain, by chance, within itself any method by which this murderous disproportion is to be avoided? If one branch of industry is in want of hands, who can answer for it that, in the confusion created by universal competition, another is not overstocked? And if, out of thirty-four millions of men, twenty are really reduced to theft for a living, this would suffice to condemn the principle.

But who is so blind as not to see that under the system of unlimited competition, the continual fall of wages is no exceptional circumstance, but a necessary and general fact? Has the population a limit which it cannot exceed? Is it possible for us to say to industry—industry given up to the accidents of individual egotism and fertile in ruin—can we say, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther?" The population increases constantly: tell the poor mother to become sterile, and blaspheme the God who made her fruitful, for if you do not the lists will soon become

too narrow for the combatants. A machine is invented: command it to be broken, and mathematize science, for if you do not, the thousand workmen whom the new machine deprives of work will knock at the door of the neighboring workshop, and lower the wages of their companions. Thus systematic lowering of wages, ending in the driving out of a certain number of workmen, is the inevitable effect of unlimited competition. It is an industrial system by means of which the working classes are forced to exterminate one another.

* * * * * * *

If there is an undoubted fact, it is that the increase of population is much more rapid among the poor than among the rich. According to the "Statistics of European Population," the births at Paris are only one-thirty-second of the population in the rich quarters, while in the others they rise to one-twenty-sixth. This disproportion is a general fact, and M. de Sismondi, in his work on Political Economy, has explained it by the impossibility for the workmen of hopeful prudence. Those only who feel themselves assured of the morrow can regulate the number of their children according to their income; he who lives from day to day is under the yoke of a mysterious fatality, to which he sacrifices his children as he was sacrificed to it himself. It is true the workhouses exist, menacing society with an inundation of beggars —what way is there of escaping from the cause? . . It is clear that any society where the means of subsistence increase less rapidly than the numbers of the population is a society on the brink of an abyss. . . . . Competition produces destitution; this is a fact shown by statistics. Destitution is fearfully prolific; this is shown by statistics. The fruitfulness of the poor throws upon society unhappy creatures who have need of work and cannot find it: this is shown by statistics. At this point society is reduced to a choice between killing the poor or maintaining them gratuitously—between atrocity and folly.

So much (continues Mr. Mill) for the poor. We now pass to the middle classes.

According to the political economists of the school of Adam Smith and Leon Say, *cheapness* is the word in which may be summed up the advantages of unlimited competition. But why persist in considering the effect of cheapness with a view only to the momentary advantage of the consumer? Cheapness is advantageous to the consumer at the

cost of introducing the seeds of ruinous anarchy among the producers. Cheapness is, so to speak, the hammer with which the rich among the producers crush their poorer rivals. Cheapness is the trap into which the daring speculators entice the hard-workers. Cheapness is the sentence of death to the producer on a small scale who has no money to invest in the purchase of machinery that his rich rivals can easily procure. Cheapness is the great instrument in the hands of monopoly; it absorbs the small manufacturer, the small shopkeeper, the small proprietor; it is, in one word, the destruction of the middle classes for the advantage of a few industrial oligarchs.

Ought we, then, to consider cheapness as a curse? No one would attempt to maintain such an absurdity. But it is the specialty of wrong principles to turn good into evil and to corrupt all things. Under the system of competition cheapness is only a provisional and fallacious advantage. It is maintained only so long as there is a struggle; no sooner have the rich competitors driven out their poorer rivals than prices rise. Competition leads to monopoly; for the same reason cheapness leads to high prices. Thus, what has been made use of as a weapon in the contest between the producers sooner or later becomes a cause of impoverishment among the consumers. And if to this cause we add the others we have already enumerated, first among which must be ranked the inordinate increase of the population, we shall be compelled to recognize the impoverishment of the mass of the consumers as a direct consequence of competition.

But, on the other hand, this very competition which tends to dry up the sources of demand urges production to over-supply. The confusion produced by the universal struggle prevents each producer from knowing the state of the market. He must work in the dark and trust to chance for a sale. Why should he check the supply, especially as he can throw any loss on the workman whose wages are so pre-eminently liable to rise and fall? Even when production is carried on at a loss the manufacturers still often carry it on, because they will not let their machinery, etc., stand idle, or risk the loss of raw material, or lose their customers; and because productive industry as carried on under the competitive system being nothing else than a game of chance, the gambler will not lose his chance of a lucky stroke.

Thus, and we cannot too often insist upon it, competition necessarily tends to increase supply and to diminish consumption; its tendency therefore is precisely the opposite of what is sought by economic science, hence it is not merely oppressive but foolish as well.

* * * * * *

And in all this, in order to avoid dwelling on truths which have become commonplaces and sound declamatory from their very truth, we have said nothing of the frightful moral corruption which industry, organized, or, more properly speaking, disorganized, as it is at the present day, has introduced among the middle classes. Everything has become venal, and competition invades even the domain of thought.

The factory crushing the workshop; the showy establishment absorbing the humble shop; the artisan who is his own master replaced by the day-laborer; cultivation by the plow superseding that by the spade, and bringing the poor man's field under disgraceful homage to the money-lender; bankruptcies multiplied; manufacturing industry transformed by the ill-regulated extension of credit into a system of gambling where no one, not even the rogue, can be sure of winning; in short, a vast confusion calculated to arouse jealousy, mistrust, and hatred, and to stifle, little by little, all general aspirations, all faith, self-sacrifice, and poetry—such is the hideous but only too faithful picture of the results obtained by the application of the principle of competition.

CHAPTER IX.

EDUCATION.

FROM what has already been said in this work, the reader has no doubt been able to form a quite correct estimate of the importance attached to thorough and universal education in the New Republic. In the attention paid to the construction of the school buildings, in the ample grounds allotted to them, and in the complete manner in which they were fitted up—with extensive play-grounds, shady groves, and every attraction conceivable for the convenience, comfort, and pleasure of the occupants—a hint of this has already been given. In truth, long in advance of the time of which I speak the conviction had become universal that the power and privilege to acquire and utilize *knowledge* were the most precious boon that had been bestowed upon man. Regardless, therefore, of the warnings of any so-called inspired prophets, priests, or books, man had placed himself among the branches of "the tree of knowledge," and, refusing to be removed, had applied himself assiduously to plucking from it that fruit which his nature so ardently craved, and which he found, as he did eat thereof, to be his chief blessing rather than his curse. By comparing himself with the other animals, man had become convinced that

in his unenlightened state he was but a degree their superior. It was knowledge a shade in advance that first gave him control over these; it was the increase of knowledge that marked the contrast still wider, giving him as he mounted, step by step, not only more extended power and dominion over the animal kingdom, but over the *elements of nature* a control that astonished even himself. This notable point in his career having been reached, man began to look back and calmly survey the rugged track he had traveled. He saw the pitfalls into which he had stumbled, the precipices over which he had fallen, and noted them with a view to guarding in future against such obstructions as might beset his pathway. Experience had further taught him that which was of inestimable value—namely, *self-reliance*. It had for some time been a question with him whether his destiny depended upon himself, or whether some sprite or hobgoblin, pictured to his imagination, might not have the power to lead him, in spite of himself, he knew not whither. He finally learned that his fate, in this world at least, depended mainly upon himself. He found that while there were no ghosts, hobgoblins, good or evil spirits, that could exert any power over him, yet all nature, himself included, was governed by fixed and immutable laws. He discovered, further, that these laws could not be transgressed with impunity, and that it was his province to investigate and strive to gain a knowledge of them that he might live in harmony with them. Then for the first time did man find himself occupying a position auspicious for improving his condition and making life upon our earth worth

living. This happy change took place when Science had fully supplanted Theology; when what was taught as truth was verified knowledge, not unreasonable speculation unsubstantiated by any credible testimony. Scientists may and do speculate; but they are honest enough to acknowledge their theories hypothetical until demonstrated. Theologians, on the contrary, invent their theories, their religions, by the score, and claim that each of them has been transmitted direct from the great *author of all that is*, though about all the similarity discoverable between their many alleged "God-given truths" is that they are all claimed to be substantiated by miracles, all share about equally in inconsistencies, incongruities, and downright contradictions, and all are about equally absurd.

We have not yet passed the theologic age, but the death-knell of Theology has sounded, and the day is not far distant when she will be laid away by the side of her sister, Mythology, another cast-off relic of ignorance and superstition. For the welfare of the race, the sooner this day comes the better, as we may then begin to build in earnest upon a solid foundation.

To study the elements, to dip deep into the mysteries of the universe, that he may obtain knowledge of inestimable value to him, is not only man's privilege, but it is necessary to his progression. Nothing more noble can possibly occupy the attention of man than a patient, laborious, unflinching research into the origin and laws of those wonderful phenomena that surround him; and it is now too late in the order of time to claim that any knowledge worth

having has been, or ever can be, obtained except through this kind of human effort. Long prior to the age of which I now speak, this had become fully settled in the minds of the people, and only that was now taught as fact which had been verified as such and might readily be again; while what was taught as probable had very good reasons given for it, and what was unknown was simply so stated.

Although not as wise in their own conceits as were they of the semi-barbarous theological ages that had gone before, the people were grounded now upon a basis from which there was no retrogression, and every step was a step in advance.

The prime object in the education of the young in the New Republic was to develop the faculties and impart such information as would be most useful in the life before them. The child began to be taught almost as it began to breathe—not by any indiscreet assumption of authority, but by the exercise of that tact which a mother's love so naturally prompts. The discipline which was to be of so much service in after-life began here. At a suitable age every child found its way to the schools, not to be set bolt-upright upon a hard bench, and to have its ears cuffed if it did not conform strictly to some ironclad system of ideal propriety, but to meet a tender and affectionate female instructor whose first care was to make it contented and happy. By a tact similar to that with which the mother had laid the first ground-work of instruction, the child was now led on to be interested in making further progress. There were no rude exhibitions of authority to prejudice, discourage, and provoke the spirit of the child, but in perfect kind-

ness, as it had been commenced by the mother, everything went on at the schools. The disposition of the child was studied, and its capacity also, in order that it might not be overtasked. The system of the schools and the curriculum of studies had changed much from those of our day, and these changes I will now proceed to state. It was an established principle of the New Republic that every child, whether male or female, white, black, or copper colored—not specially incapacitated by either mental or bodily infirmities—was not only entitled to the privilege of passing through a general course of study, but, for the mutual benefit of each and all, such an education was deemed indispensable, and must be provided.

The schools, therefore, were systematized in accordance with this fixed custom. At the head of the curriculum of studies, of course, was placed Language, or a knowledge of the proper use of the "mother tongue." The power to construct and make use of a language, both to suggest and to express and interchange thought, was held as among the highest gifts to man, if not *the* highest. Realizing the inestimable benefit which the gift of language had conferred upon man, the thought had long before arisen of the further advantage that might be derived from the construction of a Universal Language which should be spoken and written all over the world; and so, long anterior to the time of which I now speak, such a language had been constructed out of the many before in vogue, and was now in universal use.

The construction and adoption of a universal language has not received, among the thoughtful of the

present age, the attention which its importance demands. It can readily be seen that in innumerable ways such a language would be of incalculable benefit to mankind. Of course I can mention here only a few of the most important of these diverse benefits. Through it, let us say, a knowledge of the arts and sciences could be extended over the entire planet; the best thoughts of the world's thinkers could be disseminated among the different nations and races of men, which cannot be the case while so many translations and republications are required; through such a language there would be an interchange of thought, both written and oral, which would push on the march of civilization, and conduce to the good of the race to a degree unparalleled by any influence as yet brought to bear in the world's history. Its effect, it cannot be doubted, would be to interest mankind at large in the welfare of each other; while now this interest, except among people living under the same government, or nations bound in some degree by commercial relations, is about as deficient and spiritless as that of the wild animals that inhabit the forests. What interest has America or Christian Europe now in the Turks or Chinese? Little more than to despoil and drive to the wilderness or desert, on account of their religion, the former, and to make the most possible in their commercial transactions with the latter. And how many similar illustrations might be made showing how meager is the interest which the people in the different parts of the globe take in one another! It is this selfish feeling of indifference to the welfare of each other that is, and always has been, paramount to all other causes in instigating the horrid wars that

so often occur between nations; and the influence which a universal language would have toward removing this indifference cannot be overestimated. Rulers and priests whose selfish interests are maintained by keeping the people in ignorance would of course object to any such innovation; but the lover of his race, he whose ardent desire it is to see the whole family of man upon the planet knit together in one universal brotherhood, would hail with joy the advent of a universal language, promising so much as it does for breaking down the partition-walls that divide nations and races.

A little reflection will suggest to the reader many other important advantages to be derived from this same source, but as the plan of this work does not permit more than a glance at the various subjects treated; and as I have said sufficient, I hope, to set the reader thinking about the matter, I must now leave him to extend the investigation according as it may interest him.

In framing the language which I found spoken in the New Republic, much pains had been taken to make it adequate to the purposes for which language was invented. The framers had kept steadily in view the fact that the use of language was wholly for the expression and interchange of thought; and, for expression, the more simple the better. To this end the more appropriate and expressive words were selected from the various different languages then in vogue, and so changed as to adapt them to their new use, while new words were coined wherever it seemed evident that an improvement could thus be made. Words bearing a double meaning had not been re-

tained. Orthography indicated the pronunciation in the simplest manner possible. To gain a thorough mastery over the use of this new language in speaking, reading, writing, and spelling was now properly considered the first requisite to a good education. As the child began to combine words into sentences he was taught to use the proper words and to arrange them correctly, and this prompting was continued until he became quite correct and expert in his utterance.

In reading, also, the same watchfulness was observed and drill maintained. The pupil was taught to observe not only the rules of pronunciation, emphasis, expression, and such other directions as might tend to perfect him in the art, but, also —a consideration of the utmost importance—to endeavor at all times to catch the sense of what he was reading.

To allow the child to fall into an inattentive or slothful habit of reading was regarded as extremely detrimental; great exertion was put forth, therefore, to impress the child with the importance of being interested in what he read, and he was cautioned not to continue reading for a moment beyond a time when the energies should flag sufficiently to destroy his interest in the subject. To read aloud well, they said, the reader must be enabled to catch the meaning of the author at a glance, and, to facilitate this, textbooks were so prepared as to command the attention of the pupil. That the reader might be enabled to more fully comprehend the author, the practice was made incumbent upon the young, in silent reading, to have a dictionary lying by their side for reference in case of meeting with unfamiliar words.

The inefficiency displayed in teaching the pupil to read in our schools to-day is truly astonishing; and this inefficiency is still greater, I think, as a rule, in our private than in our public schools. Of the pupils that graduate from these private schools, not one in ten—perhaps I might say not one in fifty—can acquit himself in a creditable manner in this foremost of accomplishments; and the public school pupils are but a shade in advance.

The truth is, the number of good readers in our country to-day is but a small fraction of what it was fifty years ago. And why is this? The answer is readily given: It is because but a decade is given for cramming into the head more than the average pupil can acquire thoroughly in double that time. The folly of the age then says, "Give them a smattering of the accomplishments, the ornamental part"—and let that go which is really most important. Not that the essential part of all the studies now pursued may not be beneficial to the pupil, but the trouble lies in the cramming of our text-books with such a prodigious amount of non-essential matter.

How few there are at the present time, either of parents or teachers, who impress upon the minds of the young the importance of referring to their dictionaries, in silent reading, for the definition of such words as they do not understand! They will give them a smattering of half a dozen languages, quite likely, and then let them pass from the school-room into active life with a very inadequate knowledge of their mother tongue. The result of all this is that the adult must acquire, during time snatched from other pursuits, and perhaps from midnight hours, what

under proper instructions he would have learned in youth, or he must suffer the penalty of passing through life without a sufficient knowledge of any language whatever, incapable of comprehending fully what he may read, and powerless to express his thoughts in a clear, not to say elegant, manner.

In the New Republic, as the pupil advanced somewhat in his reading, he was taught to compose, to construct and place upon paper in his own language, the substance of his reading or whatever he might desire to relate concerning anything he had seen or heard. This branch of instruction was continued throughout the full scholastic term. To perfect their style, pupils were farther required to peruse the works of the best authors, and to study thoroughly the definitions and synonyms of words. Is it not surprising how little significance is placed upon this important branch of the youth's education at the present day in the great majority of our public schools? In exceptional instances teachers have risen to the importance of this question, and lessons in composition are regularly given, but in most of our public schools the pupil is taught the alphabet, to spell and read in a most inefficient manner, and then left to make such progress as he may in the use of the language, with little or no further instruction.

This is much like placing in the hands of a youth, with which to learn a trade, a great number of tools, one-half or more of which he has never seen in use, or seen at all, in fact, and expecting him, without instruction, but through his own ingenuity, to become a skilful mechanic. Such a feat, perhaps, would not be impossible, but under these circumstances,

except in a few special cases, he would be likely to reach a ripe old age before becoming very proficient as an artisan. Parents do not expect their children to pursue the art of music, drawing, or painting, without instruction, and yet this far more useful art, the art of using our mother tongue skilfully and elegantly, the common opinion seems to be, is either of minor importance or else may be sufficiently acquired without further instruction than that afforded by the driest rules of a grammar. But how few there are, however well versed they may be in the grammar of a language, who can write correctly a simple letter to a friend—much less punctuate it properly! And yet this is a qualification which every common school pupil should acquire, and which all would acquire under proper instruction and practice.

The advantage to be derived from practice in this art may be seen in the skill which compositors acquire in detecting errors or badly constructed sentences. Many an editor's proof-reader has saved his employer's reputation for writing fairly readable English by correcting his manuscript, and this, not seldom, but constantly. The "finished oration" of many a speaker, likewise, would not read very smoothly were it not for the polish given it by some penny-a-line reporter. Some of the most interesting and instructive books that ever went into the hands of a publisher—books that show an originality and an ability for grasping the full breadth of their subject, books that stamp their authors as writers of genius—would be but sorry reading were it not for the corrections and embellishments of some competent critic and the careful supervision of the proof-

reader. And yet neither compositors, reporters, nor proof-readers are such, usually, as have acquired what is termed a liberal education before commencing upon their vocations. The skill with which they detect, and the readiness with which they rearrange, improperly constructed sentences come from experience—from practice. This demonstrates conclusively the necessity of *practice* for acquiring skill in the use of language both in speaking and writing; and the time for this is in youth, when speech is first brought into use, for habits then formed are formed for life unless overcome by the most persistent effort. Few parents or teachers seem to comprehend the importance of this matter, or furnish the child with that instruction so indispensable for starting him on the right track. He is allowed to express his thoughts in the most incorrect and bungling manner, and to speak improperly without correction. In writing and composing, which are rarely attempted, except it may be in now and then a letter to a friend, he receives no instruction, nor is his production examined, inappropriate words and badly constructed sentences pointed out, and corrections made, as should be done before the missive is allowed to go. If these precautions are not taken, and the child has had no training in composition, he has no way of finding out whether he has written correctly or not, and so he goes on, violating every rule of correct writing, until he has formed a slovenly habit which is not likely to be overcome. How many a gem of thought has been bottled up, hermetically sealed in the mind, from a lack of this power of expression! Many of the most profound thinkers never give full expression to their thoughts;

and it is only on rare occasions, when some epigrammatic sentence chances to fall from their lips, that we have revealed to us the hidden stores within. Not infrequently the cause of this silence, if brought to light, would be found to be a lack of power to clothe their thoughts in language satisfactory to themselves.

Few things cause a sharper pang to the human mind than the conviction of possessing some hidden truth which, if once expressed, would be of great value to the world; but, the possessor being without the power of presenting that truth in a manner acceptable to himself, it remains unexpressed. Yet there are few, if any, human beings of ordinary intelligence who might not by proper instruction and discipline, at an early age become capable of expressing their thoughts both in speaking and writing in a correct, orderly, and pleasing manner. The reasons, no doubt, why so little attention is paid to this *art of expression* are, first, that it is regarded as important only for those following some literary or scientific pursuit; and, second, the idea prevails that it can be acquired by those only who have received what is termed a liberal education. Yet no man can open his mouth to speak or take up the pen to write but the value of this qualification is made manifest, and the more unconscious of this he is himself the more apparent it is to others. And as to its being an art which cannot be efficiently attained without first passing through a collegiate course or acquiring what is termed a liberal education, the skill which is attained by the compositor, before alluded to, as well as that of many an author who has received naught beyond a common school education, is

sufficient disproof. Neither compositor nor author, however, was ever made proficient in this art without constant and prolonged practice, and such practice is just what it should be every youth's privilege to obtain in our public schools.

The truth is that we attach too much importance to a knowledge of the rules of grammar for assisting the pupil in the construction and proper use of language. A little practice in the construction of sentences, under a good tutor, is of far more value to the pupil than all the set rules of grammar that you can stuff into his head. But what is required is, not a little, but a continual training under a good teacher until the pupil can construct and arrange words in sentences correctly and with dispatch. Along with this, the grammar may, of course, be used to advantage. The writer confesses that he has himself suffered so much from the lack of such discipline as he is here speaking of, in his early education, that he feels it hardly possible to impress too strongly upon the minds of those to whom is entrusted the education of the young the importance of this branch of instruction.

But while our common schools fail disgracefully in teaching the art of expression, in our universities an importance seems to be attached to it that is equally objectionable. Here, so much of the student's time is spent in thumbing the classics (the object being, largely, it is claimed, to perfect and polish in the art of writing and speaking properly), that he has little time left for acquiring general knowledge. The result is that he often comes from his collegiate course with a set of shallow ideas, that he spends the

balance of his days in dressing up in grandiloquent language, which he imagines to be "killing"—and he is quite right, for it is a killing of time for him who reads. From what has now been said, it will be seen that a very thorough knowledge of the one grand universal language, and the art of correct and fluent expression, were the first great advantages to be obtained by the pupil in the common schools of the New Republic.

But, in the pursuit of other studies, the mode of procedure in the common schools of the New Republic was quite different from that adopted in the study of the language; the paramount object in the prosecution of other studies being to place the pupil in a position for obtaining the greatest amount of general information possible to be attained during his scholastic term, and at the same time to give him the key to all knowledge. To this end, text-books were prepared, not only for such studies as are now taught in our public schools, but embracing all the more useful scientific studies, a knowledge of which had now come to be regarded as indispensable. But in order not to overtax the pupils in the pursuance of this more extended range of studies, their text-books were so prepared as to comprise only that information which was regarded as the most useful in the ordinary walks of life, leaving a more elaborate and comprehensive education to be acquired in the higher institutes or through private individual effort.

One of the worst present-day outrages is the attempt made in some of our public and nearly all our private schools to cram the full contents of our voluminous text-books into the heads of our youth.

The victims of this outrageous custom, with their bent and emaciated bodies, haggard faces, shattered nervous systems, and disease exhibited in a hundred forms, may be met on every hand, while thousands more cry out to us from untimely graves. Moreover, to such an extent has this amplification been carried that few pupils have the power to retain more than a modicum of what they have committed to memory. Given a six-months' vacation, and three-fourths of that which they have once learned, with sufficient success to be able to recite creditably, will be an almost total blank to the majority of pupils. You may say that this is for the reason that their lessons are not thoroughly learned. True; but I contend that it is beyond the capacity of the average pupil, during his usual short scholastic term, to master and retain in the memory anything but a minimum of what is contained in the common school text-books as they are now prepared. It would, in fact, in most instances, require a lifetime. The result of this system is to so cumber the memory that it not only loses most of this superfluous matter, but also much that is eminently useful and which would probably be retained were it alone taught. To the extent, therefore, to which the text-books of any study are thus diluted, or to which what is really useful is drawn out into tedious detail, to that extent its value to the pupil is impaired.

It may be said that nothing which tends to throw light upon any important question is useless; and this holds true, no doubt, in the case of the specialist, whose object is, or should be, to thoroughly master his subject. But it must be remembered that I am

here speaking only of that general information to disseminate which I regard as the true object of the common school, and through which a complete mastery of any particular study cannot reasonably be expected.

Another reason why the pupil retains but a modicum of what is taught through voluminous text-books is that he finds in after-life no *practical use* for it. Many there are of us who once waded through these books, but how many had not within five years, or ten at the farthest, lost the greater portion of what we spent so much time to acquire? We have found no practical use in our vocations for what we studied, and it has passed from our minds. In truth, a man must needs be a jack-at-all-trades who could find use for all the information which in diluted form it is attempted to cram into the head of the average common school pupil at the present day.

Why not, let me ask, prepare for our common schools such text-books as I found in the New Republic, embracing the elementary principles of the more useful sciences—all ascertained knowledge, in fact, likely to be found beneficial in the ordinary walks of life? Let them be prepared with comprehensiveness and brevity, and a general knowledge of all that is most useful, as well as of many subjects which are now almost like sealed books to them, may be acquired by our youth, during their scholastic term, without injury to either body or mind. More elaborate treatises should of course be prepared for the higher branches to be pursued by the specialist, or by him, who, like Bacon, has an ambition to acquire *all* knowledge, but who might now live to a ripe old

age, keeping his brain actively employed, and then die without accomplishing his design.

There is one study of which a text-book should by all means be prepared for our common schools. I mention it particularly here for the reason that at present little attention is paid to it. I refer to Physiology and Hygiene. To know one's self physically; to possess a knowledge of the wonderfully wrought human structure; to know the laws that govern our existence, and by obeying them to foster and strengthen all the bodily functions; and so to secure to ourselves that health and vigor which impart to life its principal zest, may be rightfully regarded as one of the chief requisites of a popular education.

A text-book prepared for this study in our common schools should be an exceedingly brief but general compendium, written in the most simple language, so far as possible without technical words or terms; simply sufficient to impart a general knowledge of the structure of the human form and the laws which govern and guard its healthful maintenance. In such a text-book let no false sense of modesty taboo a branch of the subject which is most important, since ignorance of it is so often attended with results the most deplorable. Are sexual relations so disgusting and evil in their nature that mankind shall be ashamed to treat of them? If so, then they should be ashamed to indulge in them also, and the sooner we all become Shakers the better. But, you say, granted there is no wrong in the matter, a natural sense of modesty and propriety forbids its being cried aloud. We grant you this, grant that it is a

subject that may not always be referred to with propriety, but we claim that it is a pernicious and contemptible false modesty that has so long allowed and still persists in allowing our youth to be reared in ignorance of that which is of such vital importance to the health and well-being of each and every one of them. Intemperance in eating and drinking have long commanded general attention, particularly the latter, while the evils arising from sexual intemperance (equal, no doubt, to either of the others) as the result of this false modesty in keeping our youth in ignorance, are allowed to go destructively on, unchecked and unhindered.

We ponder over the evils of self-abuse so prevalent among the young, and the equally destructive vice of sexual intemperance in marital life and in illicit intercourse, and yet so cowardly are we that we dare not break through the bonds of this false sense of propriety, utter our protest, and raise a cry of warning that shall reach the ears, or meet the eye, of those who are, or who may become, the victims of these life-destroying abuses. Possibly when the seeds of these evils have been so widely sown that their results cannot be eradicated, a physician may intimate in the most gingerly manner the cause of our broken-down constitutions, and then it is that the victim will fully appreciate the wrong to which he has been subjected through that false sentiment of society that has been the cause of withholding from him a knowledge that should have been imparted to him in his youth. Every physician, and nearly every parent who has passed the meridian of life, knows that nothing within the whole range of

physiology and hygiene is of more importance to the youth than a knowledge of sexual matters, and yet so tenaciously has this false sense of propriety fastened itself upon society that there are none who *dare* instruct. And since parents have rarely the courage to bring up this subject before their children, if it is also to be excluded from our text-books on physiology and hygiene, tell me, in the name of heaven, how are our youth to gain a knowledge which would be of such priceless value to them? We know that now they do not obtain this knowledge except through a most bitter experience, nor until in their systems have been sown seeds of disease that can never be eradicated. In some way, most assuredly, this knowledge should be taught the young; and if there is nothing in reproduction, common to all nature, of which mankind need be ashamed, then I for one can see no impropriety in its being taught both by parents and in our schools. Not, of course, to the two sexes in each other's presence, as there might certainly be an impropriety in this, it being entirely needless.

Another study which I found commonly taught in the New Republic was the History of Man, which was indeed one of the most, if not *the* most, instructive and valuable works ever put into the hands of a pupil. Commencing in the prehistoric age, it ran carefully through the several geologic periods, recording briefly such information as had been gathered from the footprints of man upon the earth during the infancy of the race; and continuing his progress from where history began, it singled out from the vast storehouse that gradually swelled itself into more

magnificent proportions the gist of what had transpired among all nations and all races of men having a tendency to either retard or advance man's progress. Such a repository of information, brought within the compass of a text-book for the schools, had required the research and skill of many a masterly hand to perfect, but patience and perseverance had at length succeeded in gathering together in this not very voluminous treatise more valuable information than had ever before been compressed into a single volume. The sickening, horrid details of wars, the follies and vain exploits of monarchs, chieftains, and would-be heroes of all sorts, with all else that served to detract from the strict purpose of the work, had, of course, been excluded.

Besides those already alluded to, they had also in the common schools of the New Republic text-books upon all the more useful sciences, and all prepared upon the same elementary, concise, and comprehensive principle. The key to knowledge having been given through language, the privilege was now extended to each to avail himself of all that was most important in that vast fund of information gathered through experience and study of the universe. The kernel of that knowledge, gained through the labors of the many scientists and philosophers who had gone before, in the several studies to which they had devoted their lives, was set before their youth in the common schools in a form so simple that the ordinary intellect could comprehend it; hence there was no longer any excuse for not being well informed. It was the duty and practice of the instructor to bring the mind of the pupil, so far as possible, in

actual contact with the facts to be imparted through illustration, experiment, demonstration, and verification; and to this end every school building in the land was furnished with a suitable outfit. Teaching had become a profession, and among the highest of professions. The day had gone by when a little knowledge, ensconced in a thimbleful of brains, could "pass muster" in the school-room, and the fact had also become recognized that teachers, as well as poets or artists, must be born such—that they must possess natural qualifications adapted to the profession, which cannot be acquired through any amount of preparation. But while it was held that the teacher must possess a natural gift for his calling, it was also claimed that there was a science of teaching, like that of the other professions, which it was necessary that the teacher should understand. At Science Hall, in each of the cities, therefore, those who had chosen the profession of teachers received that practical instruction which was regarded as necessary to prepare them for their duties.

Eight months of the year the common schools were in session—April, July, August, and December being allowed for vacation. They opened at nine in the morning and closed at twelve for the most advanced pupils; those of a more tender age were detained in the school-room for a less time. Lessons were usually learned out of the above hours, but in assigning tasks to the pupils great care was taken not to overtax them. Lessons of equal length were given to those comprising the same classes, but the *number* of studies permitted to be simultaneously pursued was regulated by the capacity of the pupil

to accomplish his task without overtaxing his brain: The length of time constituting a scholastic term, therefore, depended upon the pupil's ability to thoroughly complete the full course of study.

Attached to the school buildings were ample playgrounds, fitted up with every convenience for athletic sports, and here the pupils gathered, in the afternoons, to enjoy their sports, maintaining, thereby, that health and vigor which ample exercise and pleasurable amusements usually afford, and which are so particularly indispensable to the young. During the months of vacation pupils of both sexes, of twelve years and upward, were required to devote three hours out of each day to industrial occupations, either in the field, the workshop, or the household; the remainder of the time was assigned them for their sports.

I have now given the reader quite a general idea, I think, of the system of the common schools in the New Republic. Should it be thought that their curriculum of studies was rather extensive, I hardly think it can be maintained that it embraced more than a good popular education requires. It was held that every youth was entitled to such an education in the common schools as should not only fit him or her to become a useful and intelligent citizen, but that should also afford to him or her the groundwork for prosecuting intelligently any art, invention, profession, or science that his or her natural bent of mind should seem to indicate a fitness for. The common school was, therefore, regarded as but the stepping-stone to a higher and more complete education. With such advantages, it need hardly be said

that the pupil left the common school in the New Republic, at the close of his scholastic term, with a fund of general information in excess of that possessed by the most learned of our day.

There were other and very effectual modes for educating the youth in the New Republic outside the schools, but these may be spoken of quite as appropriately when we come to take the reader with us for a glance into practical Communistic life, which it is my intention to do in a subsequent chapter.

Let us now glance, again, at some of the shortcomings of our existing common school system. Among the more important of these, so important that it would hardly do to let it pass without pointing out here, is the failure to furnish to all the same privileges and facilities for a popular education that are furnished to a portion. It cannot be questioned that the raising of school-funds by taxation is a direct and gross violation of the fundamental principle upon which the system of *private property* is based, but happily the people in our republic, as well as in many other civilized communities, are so far Communistic in their views as not to insist upon exacting the full extent of what is involved in their property system. It is well, too, that this is so, for otherwise there would be little of what we call society, and the condition of mankind would be wretched indeed. But to say whether, under the system of private property, the people at large ought to be taxed at all for the maintenance of public schools, and if so, how far, is a nut which is not for me to crack, as the system I advocate gives room for no such question to arise. There is no doubt, however, about the

injustice of using this common fund—raised by general taxation—for giving some pupils such an education as will fit them for our higher universities, while others are denied even a seat in the public schools; but this is precisely what is being done in the metropolis of the western continent to-day.

It is estimated that there are at the present moment over ten thousand children of the proper school age who cannot be seated in the buildings prepared for our public schools in the city of New York. At the opening of the schools the pupils rush to them in numbers far in excess of the accommodation provided, and finding no room in the schools, thousands go away to roam in the streets and grow up in ignorance. All this, too, while the children of our more privileged class—our well to-do citizens who have sufficient means for educating their children at their own expense—are receiving in the upper grades of these public schools instruction of the most liberal and extravagant kind. In some of these schools, the higher scientific studies, and a number of the modern, as well as the dead languages, are taught, for which must be provided competent teachers at high salaries, as well as all the accompaniments necessary for illustration and demonstration. In short, the well-to-do or wealthy citizen may here give his children all the advantages of a higher order of education at the expense of the public; and not a few avail themselves of the privilege. Of course, an infringement upon the rights of private property that levies any tax whatever for the support of the schools opens wide the gate for taxing for that purpose to any extent, but justice and common sense must both

certainly insist that whatever privileges of this nature are granted under state or corporate authority must be alike and equal to all.

I, for one, therefore, protest most emphatically against being taxed to furnish one or more of our public schools with the requisites to prepare the children of Mr. Brown for college while the children of Mr. O'Reilly are not provided even with sitting-room in any school whatever, and the children of many more of our citizens are crowded together like pigs, in badly-arranged and badly-ventilated apartments, to be taught little beyond the simplest rudiments of our language. I contend that whatever is provided in our public schools for the children of Mr. Brown should be provided for the children of Mr. O'Reilly; that ample provisions should be made in our public school buildings for the accommodation of every child in the city; that these buildings should be erected upon a uniform plan, and with a view to the comfort and health of the occupants; that they should be furnished equally with the facilities for imparting instruction, teachers included, so far as practicable, and that the same studies, no more and no less, should be taught in each.

It will be claimed, perhaps, that, even were all these conditions fulfilled, many parents would be found too poor to permit of their children availing themselves of the opportunity. To the shame of the age it must be said that this is true. But what is this but a still further addition to the already overwhelming evidence presented in this work that there is something very, very rotten in the present order of things? Granting that many parents are intemperate, impru-

dent, lazy, and that for this reason they must expect that their children will suffer, there are still thousands upon thousands who have none of these vices, but who are industrious and respectable citizens, and yet from the extreme poverty of the parents the children cannot avail themselves of the opportunity to obtain a good common school education. Such evidence speaks volumes against a property system that denies to the principal producers of all wealth the means of attaining comfort and happiness, while educating, at the same time, the sharp, the shrewd, the more competent, if you please, at their expense.

As long as there is no head, no general established authority, to devise and direct in such matters, but it is left to municipalities and districts to control each in its own way, there can be no general or national uniformity in our system of public education. To illustrate, Albany might enact that her public schools should furnish pupils with the highest university education, while New York might elect to teach merely a few of the elementary branches. But, while we may not expect uniformity in the privileges and facilities afforded for a popular education under a government so complex as our own—a deficiency which, to my mind, is extremely deplorable—we certainly have the right to expect that such privileges and facilities as are afforded by each separate municipality or district shall be extended to each and all alike.

The power to regulate public education should be conferred upon either the state or general government, even so far as to say what studies shall be

taught and what means provided for teaching them, so that the privileges afforded for obtaining a common school education may be uniform throughout the land. School funds, I repeat and insist, gathered as they are by a general tax upon the people, are *common property*, and should be dealt with upon Communistic principles.

It is with pleasure that I now call the attention of the reader to the privileges and facilities offered the youth, or, indeed, those of all ages, in the New Republic, for obtaining that higher and more complete education to which the common schools were but the preparatory course that enabled the seeker after knowledge to penetrate into the exuberant fields beyond and gather from a harvest that could never be wholly garnered. The library of each and every community was replete with the standard works of the best authors upon literature, science, art—in short, everything requisite to form the kernel of all useful knowledge extant—which were supplemented by specific treatises upon all the more important and useful subjects.

In the libraries the youth, or those of any age, might indulge their taste for the pursuit of information beyond the limits of what could well be taught in the common schools. And it was here, in these libraries, poring over the works upon some special subject, that the taste or natural bent of the mind asserted itself and indicated the natural gifts of the student.

It has proved true as a rule, I think, that all are endowed with some peculiar fitness for that to which

they most aspire, and when opportunity is presented this law of our nature asserts itself.

It was in the reading-room of Library Hall, therefore, where ample time was afforded all for reading and study, that the future artist, poet, scientist, or teacher, could be readily singled out by his persistent study of that which most interested and delighted him. Often his taste or desire for pursuing some specialty was satisfied through such opportunity as was afforded for investigation in the libraries; and with naught but the advantages derived here, many became to a more or less degree proficient in the several branches to which they had specially devoted themselves, while others, with these same advantages, attained eminence in the same direction. Others, again, were not satisfied until they could probe to the very bottom of their chosen specialty, and for such more ample facilities for research were required than the libraries afforded. For the benefit of these were established the universities located at Science Hall in the several cities. Here, provided in every department with competent instructors, and furnished with every known mechanical facility for illustration and demonstration, the student had not only the opportunity afforded him for acquiring all extant knowledge of his special study, but also for pushing his investigations still farther into the vast realm of the unknown.

The privilege of entering these universities, after finishing their scholastic term in the common schools, was accorded to all, but not compulsory. They selected for themselves their specialty, and received instruction at the university in only what pertained to or

was thought to be of benefit in acquiring a complete and thorough knowledge of the specialty selected. Let it not be thought, however, that this opened wide the gates for letting in all kinds of instruction upon the plea that, to become master of any one thing, it was necessary to know everything—a notion which, if not positively asserted, meets with no small share of support at the present day. Life is too short, and knowledge too extensive, they said, for any one man to know all; so while they strove to acquire familiarity with the fundamental principles of universal science, they contented themselves with striving to become master only of the particular subject or calling which they had chosen. They did not regard the pursuit of any study as necessary or advantageous for the purpose of "disciplining the mind"—a practice now advocated and not a little pursued at the present day. There is enough to be learned, said they, which is of practical utility for all purposes of the mind's discipline, without lumbering the memory with that which is redundant.

In regard to the study of the dead languages—even those from which the existing language had been principally derived—they used a similar argument. While for some special pursuits a knowledge of these languages, they said, might be beneficial and in some cases even indispensable, yet for the generality of students their pursuit was a great waste of time; for, if pursued in order to become versed in the existing language, this could be much more readily attained through the reading of the works of good authors and referring to the dictionary for the definitions of unfamiliar words; while for readily

acquiring a more perfect knowledge of the subject it was far better to read good translations in the vernacular.

The system of school organization in the New Republic has now been sufficiently outlined for the reader to form, no doubt, a tolerably correct idea of the principles upon which it was founded. It was based, as he has discovered, upon the theory that, for the welfare of the individual, and consequently society at large, a certain amount of instruction is imperative; but, this imparted, the individual was then to be left to the bent of his own natural inclination in the further pursuit of such knowledge as might most interest and please.

Their system of compulsory and universal education was based upon the thesis that the adults are the natural guardians, protectors, and instructors of the young; that their knowledge and experience make them more competent for judging of what may be for the welfare of the young than the young themselves; hence that it is a duty incumbent upon the adult to prescribe such a system of education for the youth as will in their judgment best conduce to their welfare and happiness in after-life. Compulsory education is sometimes objected to as trenching upon the liberty of the individual, but the adults either have or have not naturally assigned to them the guardianship, protection, and instruction of the young; and if the privilege of instructing belongs by nature to the adults, which, it seems to me, hardly admits of doubt, then certainly they have the right, and it is their duty, to prescribe the mode and extent of such instruction. It may be held that, granting the above

premises, this privilege belongs then to the parents alone; but as this question of education is one that affects not only the individual but society at large, why has not society the right to protect itself in this as well as in any other case, and insist upon a certain degree of instruction, of which society itself must be the judge? In fixing the limit of a common school education for our day, what criterion could be better, let me ask, than one similar to that adopted by the New Republic, namely, to prescribe such a school *regime* for the young as it might be thought would best fit them to perform their duty toward society, and also to guide them in selecting for after-life such themes and callings as the natural bent of their minds may seem to best fit them for? The benefits to be derived from the adoption of a common school *regime* adapted to carrying out the above-named objects could not be what they were in the New Republic, for, as I shall endeavor to show in the course of this work, mankind cannot be as much their own masters under our existing property system as in the New Republic; cannot have their own command of such a proportion of their time in search of knowledge; yet to educate our youth now with objects like the above in view could not but be to a high degree advantageous. How many a natural-born merchant, physician, artist, statesman, orator, litterateur, or scientist, may now be plodding his weary way as an artisan, a plow-boy, or at some common drudgery!

That pride, power, and influence which wealth now brings to its possessor having been dissipated in the New Republic, the road to distinction lay chiefly through intellectual achievements. The common

school laid the solid foundation for all knowledge, and it was now for the individual to erect such a structure thereon as his ability or genius might enable him to do. Everyone felt that something was expected of him; and, in most cases, bent his energies with a will to that special work for which he felt himself the best adapted. It was an age in which all men looked upon the world each through his own eyes; and thought, pondered, studied, reflected, examined, analyzed. It was an age of individuality, originality, genius; an age in which no one followed blindly in the footsteps of the multitude, or pursued the pathway of others at all, except in so far as their road might lead in the direction which he had appointed for himself. It was an age, therefore, of great results. The storehouse of the universe was continually ransacked, and not without success, to discover some new treasure. Deeper and deeper was man continually carrying his research into the hidden things of Nature, and more and more did she reveal to him of her exhaustless stores. Each step forward made apparent the insignificance of the discovered compared with that which lay beyond; and as each new result contributed in a greater or less degree to the welfare and happiness of the race, and brought honor to its discoverer, there was ever a strong and noble incentive for sounding still deeper the dark abyss of the unknown. It was now, and long had been, the ambition of man to gain the most complete knowledge possible of the elements of Nature, in order that they might be utilized and controlled. In his study of the universe it had long been apparent to him that each successive achieve-

ment usually led to another and a higher one beyond. The wonderful discoveries that had taken place from the fifteenth to the twentieth century A. D., for example, had resulted in adding many upward steps to a stairway that had been building since man began his career upon the planet. And these steps led to the threshold of a repository wherein were stored vast treasures for man, and which he now entered, appropriating its contents at his pleasure. Much honor was regarded as justly due those who had opened the doors to these conservatories, but the grand achievements were by no means to be credited to them alone. The foundation upon which their stairway was built was commenced with the advent of man upon the planet; and, from time to time, more or less frequently, other stones had been added to make it more secure, or another step was added to its height. Vast indeed was the great concourse of humanity that had contributed each his mite in rearing the great Temple of Knowledge; and he must be insensible indeed who can without emotion contemplate a time when, through a proper industrial and social organization, humanity shall blend their energies in unity to rear to a more lofty height this grand structure whose upbuilding is the elevation of the race.

When we realize that man upon our planet is as yet in his infancy; that we are but children just beginning to totter in our walk; that we lack still that organization and discipline requisite to any very marked degree of success in any important undertaking, the wonder is not that we have accomplished so little, but that we have accomplished so much—

that we have been enabled to wrest from the hidden depths of the unknown that knowledge of Nature and her laws which we now possess.

When all this is considered, who shall be so rash as to undertake to say what is possible or impossible for man to accomplish? And when that epoch in his progress, portrayed in the New Republic, has arrived; when each and all are born under favorable auspices; when each inherits physical and mental vigor, instead of deformity, disease, and the seeds of death; when this vigor of body and mind is retained through systematic manual labor; when each is provided with such an education as will enable him to turn to the best possible advantage the gifts with which he has been endowed by nature; and when, added to all this, there is also a set purpose among mankind to work together in harmony to acquire knowledge and utilize it for the well-being and happiness of the race—under such favorable circumstances, let me ask, who shall have the courage to attempt to predict what is or is not possible for man to accomplish? The experience of the past century should make us a little chary of fixing limits to human possibilities.

As man goes on multiplying his knowledge; as he gains a closer familiarity with the elements, learning, thereby, to control and utilize them; as he invents instruments for surveying worlds remote, and determining their substance, laws, and motions, I, for one, would not care to venture the opinion that a point may not yet be reached in which he shall gain that ascendancy over nature which shall confer upon him power that would now be regarded as super-

human; or that, among other feats, which would seem now equally wonderful and visionary, he may not even be enabled to bridge the space between the stars. But, should it prove that these achievements are beyond the scope of human possibilities, that man's destiny really chains him to earth, there is still open to him the grandest field for thought and action, both in the acquisition of such a knowledge of the celestial bodies as may be gained from his terrestrial standpoint, and in securing the most complete mastery of his immediate surroundings—learning the potentialities of Mother Earth and her elements, and how best to utilize these for his own benefit.

CHAPTER X.

MORALITY AND RELIGION.

WHENCE arises what is termed the moral sense? The theologian answers: "It is a monitor in the breast of every individual, placed there by a Supreme Being, whereby man may infallibly distinguish between right and wrong conduct." The modern philosopher takes issue with the theologian, and holds, and has fairly demonstrated, that primitive man at least was possessed of no such inward monitor, or conscience, as it is usually called; but that the moral sense was first acquired from experience through association. Yet it is unquestionably a fact, and is so admitted by the modern scientists, that this moral sense, like physical and intellectual qualities, has since its acquirement been hereditarily transmitted from generation to generation.

I do not propose entering into a lengthy discussion of this question in dispute between the theologian and the modern scientists, but will cite two illustrations brought forward by Mr. Herbert Spencer, which would appear to quite effectually settle the matter. "The Turcoman," says Mr. Spencer, "proves how meritorious he regards theft by making pilgrimages to the tombs of noted robbers to make offerings. The Fijian regards murder as an honorable action, and is restless until he has distinguished himself by killing

some one." Mr. Spencer continues substantially (I quote from memory): "Such being the Turcoman's and the Fijian's ideas of moral rectitude, we shall certainly be obliged to confess that this monitor implanted in the soul, by Supreme Power, according to the theologian or intuitionist as an infallible guide to right conduct, teaches these savages one thing, while it teaches us another."

It is evident that primitive man commenced his career upon the earth with no knowledge whatever of right and wrong, and without possessing any guide to such knowledge, save as he was taught by experience. As they began to associate, either in families or clans, men found, no doubt, that it was impossible to dwell together in any sort of harmony without conceding to each other certain privileges or rights. It was thus through the education of experience that a moral sentiment was created that has continued to develop and grow from that day to this; and that will, as I believe, continue to grow until mankind become morally perfect. This fact of the *growth* of the moral sentiment is sufficient of itself to overthrow the theologian's or intuitionist's theory of an inborn monitor or conscience implanted in the breast by a Supreme Being, and common to all mankind. Had mankind been furnished with such a power of discrimination between right and wrong, there could have been no necessity or possibility for such a thing as growth of the moral sentiment. I know that the growth of the moral sentiment is sometimes disputed, and that it is claimed that mankind stand no higher morally to-day than they did eighteen hundred or more years ago. I deny the assertion, however, and

in support of my position will bring forward one of the most notable examples that can be found in history.

Jesus of Nazareth—according to the record given of him, a being whose moral standard reached an altitude so exalted for the period in which he flourished that he was regarded by many of his contemporaries, and by millions upon millions who have since dwelt upon the earth, including millions who still inhabit it, as deity itself—did not attain to that point of moral excellence which would have enabled him to discern some of the most flaming and pernicious of moral wrongs that constantly beset his pathway. To-day it will be conceded in all civilized communities that hardly any greater evil ever existed upon the earth than that of mankind buying, selling, and holding their fellows as property, and yet we have no record showing that Jesus ever denounced this most terrible of wrongs. From his habitual custom, as shown by the record, of denouncing great evils wherever and whenever he encountered them, it is fair to infer that he failed to denounce the institution of slavery, which flourished all around him, for the simple reason that he lived in an age when the moral sentiment of the world, his own included, had not as yet reached that degree of refinement which in our day regards slavery as an evil. Paul, the great apostle of Christendom, may be cited as another representative man of his age whose moral discernment did not discover the wrong of slavery. And so, when we take into consideration the fact that eighteen to twenty centuries ago such representative moral men as these, and many others that might be named, were not cogni-

zant of the wrong existing in human slavery, as well as in other prominent institutions of their day, need we have any doubt as to the development and growth of the moral sentiment?

But, as regards this question of slavery, we need not go back eighteen centuries to discover a wonderful change of views respecting it. Fifty years ago the general moral sentiment in our own country favored it, while to-day few will be found so profligate and bold as to give it their sanction. And this same change has taken place within a short period among all the civilized nations of the world. Nor may we look to slavery alone for an example of the growth of morality among mankind. Polygamy, which once received general sanction, no longer finds favor among civilized nations; the lives of human beings charged with witchcraft are not now sacrificed by the million, and no more does the general moral sentiment of mankind allow of their fellows being imprisoned, tortured, and martyred on account of their infidelity to the dominant religion of their country. And so we might go on to enumerate many more important changes, all pointing to the conclusion that the general moral sentiment of mankind rises higher and higher from generation to generation. Right and wrong are relative terms, differing so far at different periods that much which is generally regarded as right to-day it is not at all improbable may be set down as wrong by the next generation. And what I would here impress upon the mind of the reader is the great fact that *upon the moral growth* depends the attainment by mankind of a higher and more blissful state of existence on earth than what is now realized.

It is conduct, the acts of man toward his fellow, the building up of this great moral structure, that are to insure to humanity *in toto*, if we are ever to have it, a life worth living upon our planet.

In a knowledge of and an unswerving adherence to the uniform practice of right conduct *only*, is to be found the *summum bonum*, the sum and substance of *true religion*. Such being the importance of the thorough understanding and universal practice of *right conduct*, I shall now proceed to point out what I regard as the more important obstacles which have thus far, since the commencement of civilization, retarded the growth of morality.

These more important hindrances to the growth of morality may, I think, be named and summed up as Ignorance, Theology, and Private Property. Mr. L. F. Ward, in his valuable work, "Dynamic Sociology," holds that Ignorance is the mother of all wrong conduct, and that through a general diffusion of knowledge all wrong-doing may be overcome.

It is unquestionable that ignorance is in a very high degree conducive to vice and crime, but it is very doubtful whether a general diffusion of knowledge—were this at present practicable, and I hold it is not—would work such a transformation in conduct as seems to be apprehended by Mr. Ward. For instance, take one point, brought forward and insisted upon with much force by Mr. Ward, namely, the *positive moral right* which every individual has to the *gratification of all his natural or normal desires*, and the importance and necessity of his exercising that right. Will Mr. Ward tell us how it is possible to confer

this boon upon all mankind under the existing system of private property?

Further on, it is my purpose to show that the vast majority of the evils and crimes so common among mankind have their rise in our existing property system, and unless Mr. Ward takes the broad ground that a general diffusion of knowledge will lead to an abolition of the present property system, I can hardly discover how he expects to work out, through the means he advocates, that wonderful change in human conduct which he expects.

Indeed, I am of the opinion that the masses of mankind are already cognizant of the fact that the chief source of evils is what I have indicated, and if so, it is not lack of intelligence or knowledge that makes men persist in maintaining a system prolific of multitudinous immoralities, unless it be contended, which I admit it may be with some force, that ignorance of any proper mode of reconstruction or reorganization on a more just and equitable as well as efficient property basis has the effect of inducing men to endure present evils rather than chance those which might arise out of a new order. I am aware of the disposition of mankind to adhere to old customs and to detest innovations; nevertheless, I do not believe that it is this, or that it is ignorance in any form whatever, that prompts mankind to retain their present pernicious property system. No, not through ignorance is the system retained, but through the influence and power of the comparatively few who are enabled to control the many by the potency of that wealth which the system itself has accorded them.

This is *how* the system is retained, and the *why* is,

for the gratification of abnormal desires which the system itself has nursed into being. Unquestionably men do not do as well as they know, yet this may often arise from having been saddled by their progenitors with systems and customs that present temptations for wrong-doing which they are unable to withstand. What is requisite, then, in order to elevate the standard of morality, is not so much a general diffusion of knowledge as an abolition of wretched systems which were generated, no doubt, in ignorance, and which mankind are now well aware are prolific of multitudinous evils and miseries. Nevertheless, as right conduct cannot be expected until it is first known what right conduct is, a general diffusion of knowledge must necessarily contribute largely toward the attainment of a perfect standard of morality.

I am aware that hardly anything could be more shocking to the feelings of a multitude of very good people than the assertion that theology, or rather that *their* theology, or more properly their *theological teachings*, must be regarded as a hindrance, and a most important one, to the attainment of a high moral standard. I do not desire to offend or wound the sensibilities of these many very good people; nevertheless, I shall no more hesitate to utter what I believe to be true in this case than in other cases equally important. I freely admit that many, perhaps all, religions incorporate into their systems many very noble moral precepts, while some are particularly distinguishable for their exalted moral teaching. The Christian religion, for example, contains much of the highest moral character, and it is this,

in my judgment, that has caused it to survive thus far under the light of our latter-day intelligence.

In every moral code, and in every religion, there are more or less cardinal doctrines in which the wrong is so flagrant that no extended association or acute moral discernment is required to stamp them as highly immoral. Such maxims, for example, as Thou shalt not kill, lie, steal, commit adultery, etc., etc.—these, it need not be doubted, presented themselves to the most ordinary minds in the first stages of association, and were accepted in general as eminently proper; but when such great moral precepts were first proclaimed as: "Love thy neighbor as thyself;" or, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," we may feel reasonably confident that they arose from one or more who in moral discernment were far in advance of their age. I know it is contended by some that these precepts are worthless, as it is impossible for human beings to comply with them. This is undoubtedly the fact under the existing order of things, but remove the principal cause which makes moral rectitude impossible, that is, the system of private property, and there will be little, very little, left to prevent mankind from reaching a perfect moral standard. But that which makes theology a hindrance to morality does not lie in the fact that nearly all religions do not incorporate into their systems many worthy moral precepts and much good moral teaching. It lies in the fact that every religion or theological system contains so many absurd and senseless theorems pertaining to morality that are dogmatically asserted as truths given by divine authority, which,

though proven utterly false by time, are still clung to with a pertinacity which only theological obstinacy can exhibit.

Working upon the fears of mankind through their ignorance, as has ever been their policy, theologians have invented their moral code for each religion, mixed up with their theologic theorems, and thrust them into the faces of mankind as authoritative, because springing directly from the great Cause of Causes. Thus the sanction which these so-called "books of authority" have given to some of the most pernicious of moral theorems has perpetuated them for ages beyond their natural period of termination. Take the question of slavery again, for example, and who can divine how long the abolition of this great moral wrong was retarded through the support given it by ecclesiasticism? Who of us that can look back twenty-five years forgets with what energy the whole combined force of the Christian clergy of the South, and many of the same class at the North, sprang forward to defend from their pulpits the sacredness of this institution, bringing forward the Christian Bible from which to prove their claim? And it is unquestionable that, taking this book as an infallible guide to right conduct, slavery can be proven a "divine institution." But, as before said, the moral sentiment of the nation has advanced beyond the teachings of this book, and slavery, as well as many other pernicious institutions which this book upholds, has been obliged to yield. Moreover, through the dogmatic teachings of the Bible there are still maintained other similarly indefensible wrongs, which must go down before the advancing moral sentiment.

But it is not merely for laying down, claiming as divinely given, and propagating some of the most absurd and pernicious of moral theorems and injunctions that all theologies should be strongly condemned, but also for the incalculable immoralities, the brutal inhumanities, that have arisen in the world through the attempt to enforce upon mankind their still more absurd and pernicious theological dogmas. Cast one broad glance over ecclesiastical history from the time when the seeds of so-called revealed religion first took root among that hitherto happy and contented old Aryan race of nature-worshipers down to the present, and you will meet with such a catalogue of evils and horrors, engendered by these mischievous speculations, as shall appal the stoutest heart. Dissensions, hatred, intrigues, assassinations, and the most horrid massacres and brutal wars are but a few of the many fruits which ecclesiastic institutions have borne to mankind incessantly and abundantly. If they may be known by their fruits, is there any question that such pernicious institutions should be regarded as man-made rather than God-revealed? And do we find Christian ecclesiasticism to be less immoral or causing less inhumanity and brutality than the other theological institutions? Not a whit. In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, who taught the duty of man to man—provided his ethical teachings have not been vandalized, as unquestionably his theologic utterances have been—the sword was grasped by the inhuman Constantine, and rivers of blood, during and since his day, were and have been poured out to establish and maintain Christian supremacy. In the name of Jesus was established

the Inquisition; the stake, the fagot, the pulley, the thumbscrew, the boot, and every instrument of torture that could be devised, were invented for the purpose of wreaking vengeance upon those who refused to yield to the commands of the church. In his name multitudes of human beings have from first to last been kept in ignorance and poverty that they might be domineered over by dissolute priests and prelates working in conjunction with their autocratic sovereigns; men and women have been forced, through fear, to contribute largely of their substance, no matter if poor and half destitute, for the erection and support of magnificent temples, ostensibly as places of worship, but really for the double purpose of promoting the prosperity, the luxury and glory, of a set of artful, shameless vagabonds, and of holding their own lives, ambitions, and hopes in subjection. In his name science has ever been half throttled, and man's progress upon the earth has been retarded beyond all human conception.

I know it is claimed that Christianity has been the principal cause of that progress which has led to our nineteenth century civilization, and there are many good people to-day sorely distressed in mind lest the world lapse back into barbarism from loss of faith in the Christian religion. I have already admitted that there is much ethical teaching of a high order in the Christian Bible, but I believe that the gain in moral progress derived from this source has been much more than counterbalanced by the many bad moral theorems and absurd theological dogmas which ecclesiasticism has propounded and has made such desperate efforts to enforce upon mankind.

History shows nothing clearer than that when the Greek age of reason was superseded by the Roman or Christian age of faith civilization became paralyzed, and remained so for many centuries until, first from the impulse given by the Moors in Spain, followed at length by the Protestant revolt of Luther, the despotism of ecclesiasticism was modified or restrained in a great measure. Then education, material, mental, and moral progress, at once gained a new foothold, and have continued to advance with increased rapidity according as ecclesiasticism has weakened, showing conclusively that Christianity, or at least Christian ecclesiasticism, has been the retarder, not the promoter, of progress, of morality, of civilization.

It was when men became skeptical as to the claim that the Christian Bible taken as a whole furnished an infallible guide to conduct that the general moral sentiment of mankind was given a new and potent impetus which has brought it to a standard far in advance of that of former ages. The discoveries and teachings of Copernicus and the great scientific explorers who followed him, showing the fallacy of theological teachings as regards our planet, shed a new light upon the world, and infused a new impetus into it that has worked powerfully toward the amelioration of the condition of mankind morally, intellectually, and physically. Instead of following unquestioningly the alleged dictates of a tyrant Jehovah, endowed with the same attributes as those by whom he was conceived, or of his vicegerents the pope, the priest, and rulers who claim to rule by divine right, the more intelligent of mankind have been learning

that, if this planet is ever to become an abode upon which it will be a joy to live, they must put their heads at work to get rid of the many evils that we have inherited from the barbarous times, and substitute in their stead such institutions and rules of conduct as befit the intelligence of a more advanced age.

Again, and perhaps most significant of all, Christian theology has blown the breath of destruction upon morality by belittling good conduct to the extent even of holding it as secondary to blind faith in some untenable dogma.

All morality is as naught, says Christian theology, except we believe in Jesus as deity. And whatever immoralities or crime man may have committed, such belief *vomits* and gives him a seat in eternal glory. If there was ever anything calculated to thwart, throttle, and destroy morality, it is teaching such a doctrine as this. Right conduct, the duties of man to man, which is the very essence of right living, and which should be held as supreme above all else, is thus belittled and degraded.

It is evident that much of the tyrannic theology which has been taught and is still being taught in the world was invented that the rascally few might reign despotically over the many through this method of exciting their hopes and fears. It was conjectured, and rightly so, no doubt, that the ignorant masses could in no other manner be so easily controlled, while their natural rights were being trampled upon under this system of private property, as through the fears which might be presented to their minds of a future hell if they disobeyed, or the hopes of

a future heaven if they obeyed, priests and kingly rulers who claimed to rule by "divine right." The manner in which this is still being carried on in our churches, and particularly in the Roman Catholic church, is confirmation in no wise meager of my theory as to the origin of despotic theology. Theology, then, I claim to have been, and to still be, one of the most important hindrances to the elevation of the moral standard.

Now let us turn our attention to the system of individual property as a hindrance to morality. The multitudinous ways in which this system leads to vice and crime would hardly need to be pointed out were it not that mankind are naturally obtuse in seeking for the causes of the evils that are so prevalent around them. They behold the evils, but instead of tracing them directly to the fountain-head, the existence of a system or systems that mankind have themselves instituted and established, they charge a creator with having so constituted them that they are as "prone to evil as the sparks to fly upward."

Wherever or under whatever government the system of private property prevails, the few who wield the scepter of power which the system accords them habitually strain this power to a point wherein it causes sullen, though to a great extent it be, silent, revolt among the masses. Sometimes the screw is forced too tight, the last straw which breaks the camel's back is put on, when revolt becomes open, bloodshed follows, and a new order of things is created. Then, for a time, there may be peace and prosperity, only to be succeeded by a relapse to the previous status. The intention of the governing few

is, no doubt, to avoid such a crisis, but at the same time to put on the screws as hard as they think it safe to press them without causing this open revolt. We have, therefore, continually about us, this silent, sullen revolt, in the minds and hearts of a vast multitude of human beings, and it is this which is constantly cropping out in vice and crime. And, candidly, need we wonder at this? The weaker, though the multitude through a strange anomaly, behold the stronger, though the few, domineering over them through that mighty power which wealth creates. They behold this few living in splendor, luxuriously, ostentatiously, and in idleness, except that they may be engaged in scheming to still further augment their possessions; while they, the real producers of all wealth, struggle on in their toil, reaping few of the many blessings which their labor furnishes.

The oppressed, I say, are the many, while the oppressors are the few, and yet, so potent is wealth, through the organized methods which it has taken to protect itself, that it holds controlling power. So skilfully are these things managed through organization that the *implements of force*, in the hands of the oppressed themselves, are often turned upon those of their own class. And it is probably well, while we live under the existing property system, that this should be so. It is well that organization among the multitudes to combat their own oppression is difficult, as a rule impracticable, else change would probably come like a thunderbolt, bringing with it confusion, slaughter, anarchy—miseries far in excess of what they now have to endure. But though the governing classes, who are the few, are enabled to keep

a check upon *open* revolt while they continue to oppress the many, they are not, nor can they ever be, so successful in crushing out this sullen, *silent* revolt of which I have spoken, that convulses the world with vice and crime. Men of wealth, and consequently of power, you may hedge yourselves about with a cordon of laws that serve you in the increase and retainment of your already superfluous possessions; you may have at your command an organized force that, at a moment's notice, would plant your improved implements of destruction and death upon every rampart and street corner; and thus, no doubt, you may paralyze the arm of open revolt; but rest assured, this silent, sullen, individual revolt that rankles in the soul of every human being who feels that he is being oppressed and wronged by his kind, you can never, in any such way, either extinguish or suppress. And it is through the much brooding over their wrongs that men become estranged at first from their fellows, and ultimately reckless and desperate. They feel that the hand of society is against them, and they retaliate by paying off society in its own coin.

Getting right down to the very core of the matter, then, we shall find that most of this frightful stock of vice and crime, over which we so often stand aghast, is but the legitimate result of injustice and oppression—of the inhumanities of man toward his fellow. Truly, the reckoning is a fearful one, but it cannot be said that we reap what we do not sow. I may be accused here of aiding and abetting crime by framing for it a plausible excuse. The question, then, is, have I stated what is true or false? If true, then

were it not better to change the system that leads to such inhumanities, rather than to denounce those who expose its results?

It is contended by some that except for teachings similar to those contained in this work the toiling, struggling, half-destitute classes would remain ignorant of their wrongs and be content with their lot. But what an utter fallacy this is! Why, the veriest dolt, the most obtuse and thick-headed numskull that walks the sod of any civilized land, knows well there is something radically and fundamentally wrong in the existing order of things. The working classes know that they are the producers of all wealth, while they share few of its benefits; and if they did not know it, it would be a burning shame to humanity were there none honest and courageous enough to remind them of the fact, and that often. Yes, they do know, but, bound down as they are by custom and organized force, many plod on, silent and sullen under their known wrongs, while the bolder and more defiant wreak their vengeance upon society through vice and crime.

As I have said before, I regard the system of private property as the natural and unlimitedly prolific mother of hypocrisy, deception, and falsehood. None can escape her influences, and few, if any, are uncontaminated thereby. The child may be told that lying is very contemptible and wicked; but, while deception and hypocrisy are in common practice all about him, as they are in all society, both civilized and barbarous, with the odds possibly in favor of the latter, and while these are met with at every stage of his career from infancy to age, he has

no more chance to ward off its corrupting effects than he has to escape the contraction of a contagious disease epidemic on every hand. In fact, one of the chief aims of modern society would seem to be the cherishing and developing of these evils to their highest attainable degree of perfection. To practice them in the most skilful and effectual manner appears to be indispensable to success. Hypocrisy and deceit are the trade-marks of the age. They are the passport to good society, and a token of polish, excellence, and superior intelligence, while those not thus branded are regarded as beings of inferior quality and of little note.

Christianity, too, throws its cloak over this evil of deceit—not, as once, passively, cautiously, furtively, but those highest up in the authority of the church do not hesitate to speak out boldly, unequivocally, in its praises. A remarkable example of this nature occurred not long since when a very celebrated doctor of divinity stood up before an audience composed principally of members of the Young Men's Christian Association, in the city of New York, and in the most direct and unequivocal language announced the Christian right and privilege to use and practice deceit for the purpose of winning success—for the gaining of our ends and desires. Still, this was but an exceptional boldness in proclaiming what has been habitually—though usually, it is true, more cautiously and furtively—practiced in the church since Christianity was established. And yet what is *deceit* but the meanest, the most ignoble and contemptible of all falsehood? There is at least the merit of a degree of boldness in a downright lie,

while this detestable deceit is the very quintessence of cowardice. A downright liar may be compared to the highwayman, who, meeting you in the street under the broad light of day, puts his pistol to your head and demands your money or your life; while he who practices deceit is the assassin that, under the veil of night, steals up behind and stabs you in the back. Yet self-preservation is the first law of nature; and while a property system is retained that is notoriously unjust and oppressive, mankind will use deceit, lie, cheat, steal, and practice all other forms of vice and crime.

Now let us proceed to consider how, in another form, incalculable immorality and injustice arise out of our existing property system.

No one can deny that each and every individual upon the face of the earth *is justly entitled to what he or she may earn.* This is a postulate which it requires no argument to prove. Can that system of property be a wise and just one, then, which allows the masses of mankind to be systematically cheated out of their earnings by a few who are sharper, shrewder, or who are in any way more competent? Think of it, now. Here is a question of morality, of justice, and I want you, reader, to put the question to your own conscience and see what will be its answer. This is a question of justice, too, which is so often brought up *in support* of the system of private property, and against the collective property system, that I propose now to completely unravel it, that the reader may discover where the truth in the matter lies. I admit that in a community where all would share alike in the benefits of property, some

degree of injustice in the matter of earnings would naturally arise from some being able to earn more than others, either physically or mentally, or perhaps in both capacities; but the question is whether the injustice so arising would be equal, or in fact anything near equal, to the injustice arising out of the workings of the existing property system. Will anyone claim that a sum approximating what we are accustomed to call a large fortune can be acquired from what *one earns?*

Think of it, reader, and see whether you are not satisfied in your own mind that such a thing as a fortune of, say $100,000, even, would not be a very rare thing indeed should each person be held strictly to the accumulation of his own earnings. Leave the laws of bequeathment just as they stand to-day, and I doubt much if an accumulation of $100,000 would ever be known; for the daily requirements of one's self and family, if he has one, would take no small share of such earnings. Take, as an illustration, those who labor physically or mentally for a salary that is supposed to be based upon earnings, and see what will be the result. But it is useless to cite the case of the manual laborer, for he, we know, even if he be the most skilful mechanic, can rarely save much beyond his daily wants. Take, then, the salaried class who are the best paid, and whose salaries are supposed to be based upon earnings—such as the higher salaried clerks, bookkeepers, ministers, editors, and authors, as well as superintendents and managers of great enterprises, public or private—and see how many you will find of this class who never having had any other source of in-

come except their salaries, have gathered together $100,000. And yet most of the above-mentioned class are really paid above their actual earnings, as compared with mechanics and day-laborers, from the fact of their ability to fill places wherein the profits of the business, through the spoliation of the producing classes, warrants the paying of great salaries to have the business attended to. Putting the wage of a common day-laborer say at $2—more than an average price in this country, and thrice that of the same in the old world—and that of a skilled mechanic at $4; and upon this basis surely $10 per day would be an ample comparative price for the wage or earnings of an individual in any place or calling whatever. This amounts to $3,130 a year. So we may readily see that great fortunes would be impossible under an adjustment wherein *incomes were derived from earnings only*; an adjustment, however, which no candid individual can deny to be the true and just one. Unequal conditions among mankind would not long exist, I take it, under such a state.

But here comes in that contemptible argument always brought forward when things are presented in this light, namely, that we who ask for such an adjustment of things would level all mankind to a condition but a trifle above the brute; that under such a state there could be no leisure for the cultivation of the mind, consequently no literary achievements, scientific knowledge, high art, nor any public or private improvements of a high order—in short, no civilization. Well, if these things cannot be gained without the spoliation of the many for the benefit of the few, then justice would say, *let it be*

so: but such is not the truth, and he who uses such an argument, if he is not a dolt and has ever given an hour's serious thought to the matter, well knows that it is not. The truth is diametrically the opposite of this, as a moment's reflection will make apparent to all. When a considerable number of the human race could no longer exist through the spoliation of their kind, but would have to go to work and earn the means for their support, this vast non-productive class would then become a productive class—unless they chose to starve—adding, thereby, immensely to the material wealth of the country.

Moreover, besides securing the material comforts, yes, even the luxuries of life, to all, it would afford what but few have granted them now, that is, leisure and opportunity, for culture, and the prosecution of those higher works of art and of the intellect referred to above.

Having fully demonstrated the truth of my proposition, I now assert, without qualification, that it is impossible for men to become rich from their own earnings.

The system of private property, then, provides for and sanctions the few becoming rich from the earnings of the many. More than this, such a state of affairs cannot be prevented under the system of private property.

It is absolutely impossible to so adjust the relations of capital and labor under this system as to prevent it. The moment that exchange or trade in the products of labor sets in, that moment it is beyond man's power, under the system of private

property, to secure to the laborer the value of his earnings. Through the channels of trade, and the accumulations from usury, as demonstrated in a former chapter, he is sure to be robbed of a just equivalent for his labor.

It is idle, then, to talk about the injustice of each sharing alike in material comforts, as proposed under the system of collective property, when such monstrous injustice is continual and cannot be prevented under the private property system. The injustice of the latter, when compared with that of the former, is as a mountain to a molehill. Yet we are told that these things are "all right;" that, no matter how big the pile, if a man is shrewd and able enough to gather into his hands the fruits of others' earnings, so long as he does not *transgress the law*, he is justly entitled to all he can get. And, monstrous as are such teachings, they are, nevertheless, but the natural outgrowth of a property system indescribably cruel and unjust.

The broad charge that nine-tenths of all the evils with which mankind is afflicted spring from the system of individual property would be by no means extravagant. In our own, as in other lands, the prodigious restraining force of government is employed almost wholly in the property interest. To protect this interest, legislatures are almost constantly engaged in the framing of laws; the courts, both civil and criminal, in executing them; prisons are built to receive those committing infractions against these laws; and it is the property interest that constitutes the chief source from which spring all revolutions and wars. It will be seen, then, that

I am not speaking at random or extravagantly in imputing to our property system most of the evils from which humanity suffers.

But Christian theology tells us that evil came into the world through the eating of an *apple*. As to this being the origin of evil, that is not so clear; but there is one way in which it must be admittd that the writer of that famous legend has made a closer hit than is usual with theological writers. The hereditary transmission of evil tendencies—a fact which is now undeniable—is very fairly illustrated in this story; and, it being unquestionable that traits of character are transmitted from generation to generation, we have, then, the fearful fact brought plainly to our understandings that children are every day being born into the world inheriting that *inordinate selfishness which is the source of so much evil*, and which the system of private property through many generations has nursed into a monster of the most prodigious proportions. Need we wonder, then, that there abound among us the many criminals and incorrigible rascals that make our world a veritable hell upon earth?

Yet, with all the multitudinous and astounding moral evils growing spontaneously out of it, it is asserted, and by none more emphatically and dogmatically than by Christians, that the system of private property is a "divine institution;" hence that it should be regarded as sacred. If an institution so pregnant and overflowing with all that is rotten and corrupt as is this private property system is the work of a Supreme Ruler, then this Supreme Ruler, whoever or whatever he or it may be, is a fit subject

for man's detestation. But in alleging that this institution in question is of divine origin, or that it has been perpetuated through divine agency, I would remind Christians of the fact that they ignore the spirit and teachings of one whom they worship as deity.

Jesus, it is true, according to the record, taught no specific property system, but he did denounce riches in emphatic and unqualified terms; and he did teach the necessity of conduct that cannot possibly be practiced under the system of private property. Indirectly, then, at least, Jesus gave the system his strongest condemnation. And so cognizant of this were the disciples and immediate followers of Jesus that immediately upon his death they established a system of community of goods. This did not long continue, it is true; but that argues nothing against it, and only goes to show that mankind were still too selfish and brutal to accept so high and noble an ideal.

So far from being a divine institution, the system of private property was not devised and instituted even by wise and noble *men*, but by ignorant, selfish, brutal, hardly human creatures, in a semi-barbarous age. It took its origin, unquestionably, from the instinct of self-preservation, but it was, nevertheless, a conception of ignorance, selfishness, and brutality. It originated when mankind were guided by the instincts which actuate the big dog in appropriating to himself a bone to which the small dog has an equal right, and through the power of the strong arm alone has it thus far been retained. Wisdom and the moral power, which have ever existed side

by side with and diligently combated the system, have not, as yet, proved equal to its extermination; but when knowledge and wisdom become more widely diffused, and the moral standard reaches a higher altitude, there is no reason to doubt that this will be accomplished.

Another question here presents itself in connection with this fallacious claim that the system of private property is a "divine institution." Those adhering to this claim allege that charity, also, is a "divine institution," given man to cover the "multitude of sins" growing out of the private property system. This peculiar notion, though in keeping with many other theological dogmas, requires a moment's attention here:

Is charity a good in the abstract, or is it only a relative good? We answer that it is a good, since, having the system of private property established in the world, it serves in a measure to counteract the miseries arising from that system. But it seems to me clear that in this relation only can it be regarded as a good; and that it would otherwise find no place in the world. Moreover, its influences are by no means wholly good as matters now stand, for, as a rule, the energies of man are paralyzed to a greater or less extent the moment he becomes the recipient of charity. In him who receives alms, self-reliance, as well as pride and manliness, must ever receive a weakening and humiliating blow. As it is unnatural for man to be dependent upon his fellows to supply his physical wants, so any system of property that necessitates such a condition must be a wrong and unnatural system.

To bring out and call into exercise the higher qualities and faculties of a human being, to fit him for being influential and useful, and to enable him to enjoy his own existence and to help others enjoy theirs, it is necessary to avoid crushing his spirit, his pride, his manliness. He must be placed upon a worldly equality with his fellow-beings and not made dependent, except in so far as the dependence is mutual. No property system providing for less than this is fitted to rule man in his social relations.

Were the few noble souls who are charitable at heart to dispense alms with a hand so liberal as to relieve all suffering, how long a time would it require for the givers to beggar themselves? Not long, it is quite evident; for such has been the spirit of *selfishness* engendered by this very system of private property itself that the thoroughly unselfish are lamentably few. Besides, they are not usually those who hold large possessions.

A *wholly* unselfish man is quite out of place in a community adopting this system of private property. The soul of such a man is continually tortured by the miseries which he beholds about him. He gives, gives, gives, until, having exhausted his means, he finds himself reduced to the condition of those he has attempted to relieve. Then, crushed to earth, he, with his family, if he be so unfortunate as to have one, sinks into dishonor, destitution, and misery, to be ignored, perhaps forgotten, and trampled upon by the great and heartless world.

Thus, while I regard charity as indispensable under our existing property *regime*—being at no loss to discover that the lot of a vast number of human beings

would be infinitely more deplorable without it—yet, at the same time I can regard it as but a *relative* good, and hold that it would be wholly uncalled for under a wise and just ordering of property relations.

Behold, then, the wretchedness of a property system which generates such innumerable evils and crimes, against which morality can make but exceedingly slow headway. Behold, also, the cruelty of a system which is the mother of incalculable miseries that can be relieved only by charity, which, at best, is but a temporary and very inadequate relief—an antidote which impoverishes him who gives and unmans him who receives. From the bottom of my soul I abominate this system. What is it, in truth, but a game of push and pull, in which the strong, the unscrupulous, the selfish, and the corrupt—by observing a few regulations made by themselves against direct stealing—are privileged to use all the subtle and nefarious arts the mind can concoct to filch from the multitude, even to impoverishment and destitution?

Under the individual property system, the most powerful of all incentives that govern mankind is the accumulation of property. And why should this not be so, while position, comfort, influence, honor, power, glory, yes, and the very means necessary to existence depend so much upon wealth? Moralists, and preachers of all sorts, may rail against it with all the power at their command, but so long as this institution of private property remains, so long will the accumulation of property be the chief aim and end of the multitudes of mankind. It is but natural that such should be the case. The better

spirits, too, may bewail the continual prevalence of vice and crime in the world, but while we retain a property system which is clearly shown to be the paramount cause of nearly all evil, their lamentations are sure to continue, and their expostulations will prove futile.

We have found, then, that the chief of all hindrances to the progress and completion of our great moral structure is this system of private property — the Pandora's box from out which springs most of the evil we have in the world. To limit in some manner the present power of this happiness-destroying system is the work of the present age, while to get rid of it wholly is the work of the ages that shall succeed ours. And though it now stands up before us demanding a place among the gods, it has been mine to gaze enraptured upon a land wherein dwell a people who had long before dethroned the ungodly institution, hence I am not in the least disconcerted by its bold presence and haughty airs. I know that it must eventually step down and out, like everything else standing in the pathway of that great Humanity which is moving on toward that perfect state of existence ultimately to be realized upon the earth. *Genuine* humanity, or morality elevated to that high altitude from which it passes into what perhaps may not inappropriately be styled *true religion*, is, something utterly impossible under the system of private property. It is curious, though many times painful, to contemplate the subterfuges which men conjure up to excuse in themselves the inhumanity which is really chargeable to our property system. They tell us that the squalid beings we see

about our streets are but the victims of their own improvidence. Some go so far as to regard these as merely the dregs, the offscourings of humanity, the speedy removal of which, by disease and death, would be a blessing to the race. "We owe them nothing," say they, "neither sympathy nor kindness. To dispense charity to them is a positive wrong, as it not only encourages them in their intemperance and thriftlessness, but wastes the means of the better portion of the community." While there is in some measure both truth and falsehood here—falsehood as to the *true cause* of their wretchedness, and truth as to the result of extending charity to them—there is, also, that which is exceedingly inhuman. The criticism of and feeling toward the poverty-stricken exhibited in the above is unquestionably more severe than the average, yet the coldness, the indifference, the inhumanity, which the workings of our property system oblige even the most sympathetic and noblest hearted to exhibit toward the unfortunate is indeed in the highest degree deplorable.

You who live in our cities and villages, see around you from day to day human beings sunk to the very depths of misery—beggars whose rags barely cover their nakedness, shivering with cold, and pinched with hunger, as their haggard faces and emaciated forms but too plainly attest; and yet, putting, perhaps, a few coppers in their hand, you go on, inexorable fate, as it would appear, compelling you to pass them by and leave them to their distress and wretchedness.

And why is all this inhumanity? I will answer for you. It is because, living under a system of

property in which humanity has no place or part, you are fully conscious that were you to live up to the higher sentiment of your nature and endeavor to relieve their distress you would plunge yourselves into the same inextricable pool of misery. So it is that, while our earth produces an abundance to supply all our natural wants, this detestable property system comes in, beggaring the toiling producers, surfeiting the scheming non-producers, and compelling us all to be inhuman and brutal.

I have now reached the proper point for making known to the reader the standard of morality in the New Republic. The moral sentiment there condemned as inhuman and brutal the gratification of one's self in any luxury, or even comfort, derived from human industry combined with nature's blessings, that was beyond the reach of others of his kind by whom he was surrounded.

The injunctions attributed to the great Moralist, "Bear ye one another's burdens," and "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," had become something more than meaningless platitudes; they were accepted, and lived up to with unswerving devotion. The foundation of the Great Moral Structure had been rendered complete by extirpating the system of individual property; and now this magnificent monument of human triumph, of human virtue, of all that is best and noblest in the human heart, towered aloft, the most glorious structure ever reared by man.

Shall it be said, then, that the dwellers in the New Republic had not a religion? It seems to me that a people evincing such an altruistic spirit possessed a

religion of the highest and noblest kind. Their religion was exhibited in their conduct, and it is conduct more than aught else that controls the destinies of mankind. "Did not the dwellers in the New Republic believe in a God?" would you ask? They, like all intelligent, thoughtful people of the present age, were conscious of a Power behind the universe, so to speak, that manifests itself in the wonderful order and harmony of Nature. "But," said they, "of this Power itself we know absolutely nothing, and so little can be conjectured from its manifestations that it is presumptuous to attempt expressing or defining it." They regarded such an attempt, in fact, as not only absurd, but sacrilegious. The day of the theology-maker had passed, never to return.

They had their speculative theories concerning the great mysteries which so forcibly present themselves to the human mind. The great question rose up before them: Is that mysterious Force that moves and rules the universe in all its order and harmony a thinking, designing Personality—an Infinite Mind? Again, what is man's true place in a world so vast and mysterious? and shall there be accorded to him a future existence? These great questions, I say, still rose up before the minds of men, but to them, as to us, *there come no definite answer.*

They speculated upon these great questions, but were honest enough to acknowledge that their theories respecting them were mere speculations. But not to be able to solve these mysteries no longer disturbed the peace and equanimity of the mind.

"Do your duty faithfully; make life the sweetest

and happiest you can for all," they said, "and fear not for the future." Not "Salvation through Faith," as Paul taught, but "Happiness through Good Works," was the motto of the dwellers in the New Republic. Such, in a few words, gives the substance of their religion, and yet, simple as it was, it was ample for securing such peace, content, and satisfaction in the souls of men as can be hardly conceivable in this age of selfishness, superstition, and creeds.

CHAPTER XI.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

MARRIAGE in the New Republic was a contract between the parties to the union, dissoluble at the will of both, or at the request of either. This contract, signed by the parties and properly witnessed, was recorded in the archives of the community wherein the woman dwelt at the time of the marriage.

The marital relation was entered into with the intent and hope of augmenting the happiness of the contracting parties; hence, if found, upon trial, that a mistake had been made in selection, and that the parties could not dwell harmoniously and happily together, then upon the application of either party to the union, a record of separation was made directly beneath the marriage record, and the contract was thereby annulled. As to the duties involved in the marriage relationship, the people in the New Republic were much better informed than those of our own day. They were well versed in the physical laws of their being and the laws of inheritance; they knew of the baneful effects of sexual abuse, and the responsibility which rested upon them in the matter of reproduction. Public opinion was, in fact, so severe against reproduction under the physical or mental disability, to any marked degree,

of either party, as to effectually restrain all errors of this character. I am quite well aware that the view of the conjugal relationship here expressed will be not a little shocking to the sensibilities of those accustomed to regard this matter from a scriptural standpoint; as well as by another large class who call themselves conservatives and who are quite satisfied with the customs that have arisen in a barbarous or semi-barbarous age. But, as is well known, there exists among all peoples styled Christian two very diverse opinions or theories concerning marriage and divorce. We have the view entertained by the church, *i.e.*, the ecclesiastical, or, as some might prefer to call it, the scriptural view, which regards marriage as a sacrament, and permits divorce only for adultery, neither party having the privilege to remarry. This amounts, practically, to the indissolubility of the marriage bond. The extreme opposite view cuts loose from all ecclesiastical or scriptural authority, and regards marriage as properly a civil contract, which, like all other contracts, should be revocable by the consent of the contracting parties; and holds that in case one party only desires to be released from the bond, the matter should be adjusted by the courts. Between these two extreme views there are also held a multiplicity of views more or less rigid, according as the holders may respect the dictum of ecclesiastical authority, or as they may regard the subject upon its merits.

As a result of these two diverse opinions, modified by the many intermediate ones, we have instituted in the several states of our country such a hotch-potch of marriage and divorce laws that the most

acute and profound of our jurists are unable to bring anything like order, harmony, or justice out of them. This marriage and divorce question, at the present moment, then, is a particularly important one, not only by reason of its tremendous bearing upon human well-being, but also from the present disorganized condition of our laws on the subject. So, notwithstanding the question has been discussed until worn threadbare, and that one can hardly hope to do more than gather together old thoughts and reproduce them in a new form, I shall here venture my say. If nothing more, I can at least record myself upon the side of progress.

The supreme assurance with which ecclesiasticism, despite its many blunders, has long, and does still, set itself up as an authority upon this, as upon nearly all important subjects, would be astounding were it not so familiar. The Roman Catholic or original Christian church, from which comes the dogma of indissoluble marriage, has always proceeded upon the principle that it knows all that is worth knowing of what pertains to the welfare of mankind, and any expressed opinion of dissent from the teachings of this "infallible" church has been met with a cry of "blasphemy!" and the prediction that mankind would inevitably be ruined unless the *dicta* of the church were piously followed.

I submit, however, that before any scriptures are entitled to be regarded as authority on marriage and divorce, or any other question, they should at least be harmonious within themselves, and their alleged truths such as shall not admit of refutation. Let us, as we proceed to examine the marriage and divorce

question, accept scriptural teaching so far as it accords with man's experience and good sense, and no farther.

The first important matter to which I would call the reader's attention is the position in which the contracting parties are placed by submitting to our present *forms* of marriage. Think how lightly, inconsiderately, and unmeaningly the most sacred pledges are made under our present marriage service. The priest or magistrate exacts from each of the parties a solemn promise to "love and honor" (perhaps to obey, on the part of the wife, though this is sometimes left out) "until death shall them part," knowing well, if he has ever given the subject a moment's reflection, that what they pledge may be entirely beyond their control. This is no less than asking the contracting parties to commit perjury. If the priest or magistrate, the contracting parties themselves, and the witnesses to the ceremony do not know this to be the fact, the broken marriage vows of thousands should be enough to open the eyes of the blindest.

I do not say that the two most interested parties may not be honest in their intent, but I do say that they pledge themselves to that which proper consideration and reflection would convince them may be beyond their control. I hold, therefore, that such pledges in the marriage contract are highly improper, immoral, and reprehensible.

Another serious difficulty encountered in examining the subject is the fact that the enactment and enforcement of laws for the protection of indissoluble marriage is virtually an attempt to *coerce the affections*

—an utter impossibility either for the law or the individual. The element which governs, or should govern, the sexual relations, *i. e.*, love, is a mysterious power which arises unbidden, pursues its object often blindly, perhaps fiercely, and then without apparent cause oftentimes disappears as mysteriously as it came. It is quite apt to clothe its object with imaginary virtues, which hallucination is likely to be dispelled by the intimate relationship of marriage, when love is often turned to hatred, perhaps to loathing, and esteem changes to contempt.

Love, then, being an element of human nature that cannot always be governed by the will, the individual cannot justly be held responsible for that which is beyond his control. For the law, therefore, to attempt to enforce an affection between two individuals of opposite sexes simply because they chance to be married to each other, is as futile as it is senseless.

Tie man and woman together avowedly for life, and when either begins to realize their mistake, the very fact of their being apparently life-bound has the strongest tendency to intensify their grievances, and set them to conjuring up means by which their chains may be broken. For the purpose of severing this cast-iron marriage bond many a crime has been committed which would have remained undone had the facilities for divorce been easier; and many a couple have separated who would have continued to live together but for the existence of a law that said, virtually, "You shall not part." The ability to apply for and obtain a divorce at any time upon a plea of incompatibility of disposition or character would induce

many to try a little longer, until finally, coming to understand each other better, differences would be adjusted, stronger attachments formed, and eventually they would not desire separation.

Again, as love cannot be bound in chains, a sense of the obligations embraced in indissoluble marriage has a direct and powerful tendency to destroy it. The difference between the attention which the betrothed pay to each other and that exhibited by the married is so patent to all that it has even become a subject for jest, though when seriously considered it will be found too painful for treating lightly. Notice the lovers—all attention, watching for opportunities to contribute to each other's happiness; no sacrifice is too great, no effort is wearisome, and moments of separation are regarded as time lost. Observe them a year after marriage, and wonderful will you too often find the change. They may not be indifferent to each other's happiness, but how have their efforts relaxed for maintaining it! Efforts to please have ceased in a great measure, and absence from each other's society is no longer unbearable. They find, now, that each has peculiarities not altogether lovable, which neither is so careful as formerly to conceal or restrain, and which, to put it no stronger, are apt to break out at times in a little unpleasantness. I speak of the average marriage only, not of the best or the worst.

And now would you tell me that the indissolubility of the marriage tie has no hand in producing this painful result? If divorce were made obtainable, say upon incompatibility of disposition, and the married were at any time liable to lose their part-

ners through inattention, inconstancy, or ill-temper, is it probable that there would be this melancholy difference in attention so perceptible between the lovers and the married? Would not the married then, too, be upon the alert to please and not offend, that they might hold fast to the one whom they had singled out from among all others for a life companion? The days of betrothal are always the happiest. Why not, then, let marriage make courtship perpetual?

"But," says one, "it is not the intent of the law to coerce the affections, but to compel the married to remain so in form, whether there is any love and respect between them or not." But this only places the matter in a worse predicament than before. For man and woman to cohabit and have sexual intercourse where mutual love and esteem do not exist, is the worst form of prostitution that can possibly be imagined. "But the law does not compel sexual intercourse!" Admitted; but let us see what it does compel, and what are the legitimate results of laws enacted and enforced for the protection of indissoluble marriage. The law says substantially this: "You who have made a mistake in marriage [and their name is legion] shall be given no opportunity for rectifying your mistake, but you may dwell together without sexual intercourse, or in the worst form of prostitution if you are beastly enough to do so, begetting children to inherit your animosities and become subjects for our prison houses and the scaffold; or, if you prefer, you can separate. If you separate, however, I shall still hold you married to all intents and purposes, and forbid either of you to contract another

marriage except, fortunately for the one, the other dies or gets caught in adultery. An encouraging prospect, truly, for one who has purchased a ticket in this marriage lottery and has drawn a blank!

It comes to this, then, that under the laws of most of the states of the American Union a man or woman must be punished—and such a punishment too!—merely for having, with the best of intent, made an unfortunate mistake—in a word, for not having had the penetration to read the full character of the being to whom he or she has been united, and know beforehand whether or not it were possible for them to dwell together in happiness. And this is virtually affirming that to escape such punishment, men and women must be either extremely fortunate or divinely omniscient?

We all know the difficulties which the sexes now encounter in endeavoring to study each other's character, and I shall not stop here, therefore, to enumerate them. John Stuart Mill has given it as his opinion that "no more difficult question ever presented itself for the solution of a human being than the selection of a husband, except it be the selection of a wife." This opinion will no doubt be ratified by the vast majority of mankind. Earth presents few horrors more acutely painful to a sensitive, liberty-loving man or woman than that of being chained by the law in lifelong bondage to one for whom loathing has taken the place of love and respect. To such a nature, prisons and dungeons are a paradise compared with being thus bound.

What sense or justice is there, then, in holding together, and regarding as married, a couple who have

become thus estranged? I am speaking now of those who have no children.

"But," says the advocate of indissoluble marriage, "the divorce laws must be uniform; we cannot discriminate in our laws between those who have children and those who have not." I shall not grant this, as I see no reason why divorce laws may not properly thus discriminate, provided it be a fact that the welfare of the children constitutes a bar to the divorce of their parents. If this is not the case, however, then there is no necessity for discrimination. But should we find that the necessity for divorce is as great, perhaps greater, where there are children in the case, then our further argument in favor of more liberal divorce will be alike applicable whether there be offspring or not. This question of the welfare of the children is one of the two principal arguments always brought forward in favor of indissoluble marriage; yet it would seem that those who advance it must have examined it little and reflected less. Glancing at the facts in the case, we are first led to a consideration of the evil of begetting progeny in unhappy wedlock. No physiological fact is clearer or better demonstrated than that the disposition and character of the parents are usually reproduced to a considerable extent in their offspring. Consider, then, the evil of bringing children into the world corrupted by inheriting the ill-temper, the bitterness, and the animosities existing in the hearts of an ill-mated but marriage-bound couple. The inheritance of evil dispositions is great enough under parental conditions the most favorable, without being aggravated by laws and customs the tendencies of

which are to coerce the cohabitation of those who loathe each other, and the begetting of children to inherit the hatreds and acrimonies of both.

If there were need of a law here at all, it seems to me its object should be to *prevent* cohabitation and the begetting of children under such circumstances, rather than to practically enforce them. But the only law needed is one that shall set the unhappily-mated free, and thus put an end to reproducing in children the evil dispositions caused by an unhappy alliance.

And now as to the effect upon the disposition and character of children reared, as well as born, under the influences and surroundings of a home—if a home it may be called—where the ill-temper of the parents is almost daily exhibited. That home which is not cheered and warmed by a mutual affection and sympathy between husband and wife, father and mother, is not a proper place in which to mold the character of the young. Even when the differences of the parents are sufficiently restrained to prevent open rupture in the children's presence, the atmosphere pervading such a home is detrimental, if not absolutely fatal, to the growth of the better attributes of the child's nature. But rarely is such restraint as this possible. Under such conditions as these, men and women must be something more or less than human who, even in the presence of their children, are always capable of restraining their conduct. The real truth is, that, in the great majority of cases, the conduct of the parents is under very little restraint, and frequent and bitter are the quarrels which the children are allowed to witness,

with the most deplorable consequences to themselves. Customs and laws which are responsible for the infliction of such wrongs upon badly matched parents and their offspring should certainly be done away with unless it can be shown, which I doubt, that greater evils would arise from their extinction than from their continuance.

While we live under laws guarding the rights of private property, the law should of course take cognizance of the property rights of the wedded pair upon a dissolution of the marriage bond; it should also compel the parents to maintain their minor children, if they have such, and the law should have the power of disposing of their custody. Experience, however, has demonstrated the fact that there is no disposition upon the part of parents, when granted either a limited or an absolute divorce, to renounce their offspring, or to attempt to evade the maintenance of them; on the contrary, it appears to be a law of nature that where the conjugal affections are severed the parental affections become intensified; and the chief difficulty which arises between parents upon separation usually is as to which shall have the custody of the children. I fully realize the sad condition of children whose parents have become separated; but between two evils it is always better to choose the least; and rather than that their young lives should be clouded and their hearts corrupted by the debasing influences of an unhappy parental home, far better, in my judgment, would it be for them were their custody assigned to one or both of the parents occupying separate domiciles; or, in case neither of the parents were fit recipients of such a

charge, that the state should assume their care and education as in the case of orphans and foundlings. While I believe it an error in judgment, therefore, for parents who have become so alienated in their affections that they cannot dwell together in harmony, to continue such intimate relationship for the sake of their children, the purity of the motive might make this excusable providing there was no further sexual indulgence; but to continue in beastly prostitution, and to bring children into the world under such conditions, is too infamous for toleration in civilized society. And, by the way, there is another class no less to be despised than those of whom I have just spoken. They are those who, with or without offspring, continue to live together for no other reason than a lack of courage to confront the criticisms, and perhaps social ostracism, which would be liable to follow their separation. Men and women so void of moral courage as to be swayed from acting upon their convictions of right and wrong in that which concerns themselves alone merely to avoid the tongue of scandal, are but ciphers so far as their influence for good in society is considered, and are little deserving of sympathy for any punishment consequent upon their cowardice.

We may now resume the argument in favor of more liberal divorce, unqualified as to conditions, confident, it appears to me, that perfect freedom of divorce is as much demanded in case of unhappy marriages where there are children concerned as where there are not, and perhaps even more.

From the fact that two persons who cannot live happily together in that relation have linked their

fate in marriage it by no means follows that either of the parties might not live happily with one to whom his or her nature is adapted. I know it is sometimes asserted by the sticklers for indissoluble marriage that the parties who have made one mistake in their marriage selection are not likely to be more wise in another. But experience, I think, does not bear out this assertion. Instances are common where parties who have obtained a divorce in some of our states in which divorce is made comparatively easy, have married again with the happiest results. "A burnt child dreads the fire," and they who have once married unhappily are not likely to be hasty or rash in marrying a second time. It is true, there is a possibility of their choosing unwisely again, as omniscience is not an attribute of man or woman, and if so, I can see no impropriety in giving them a third opportunity, or as many as are necessary for the selection of a partner with whom, if such be possible, they can dwell in peace. My own belief is that as a rule, within the circle of every human being who dwells among his kind, there are those of the opposite sex who are by nature adapted for making him a satisfactory life companion. Under existing society there may be exceptions to this rule, as occasionally may be found a human being with whom no man or woman could live peacefully, but these exceptions are probably rare. The great difficulty is for those to get together who are by nature adapted to each other, and as this may not always be accomplished at the first trial (though generally by proper association and acquaintance I think it would be), then it would seem that, as the union of the

sexes is unquestionably the true state of existence for mankind, they should be permitted to keep on trying until a satisfactory choice is reached.

That the *monogamic* union of the sexes is also the natural and true union is equally beyond doubt. I am not an advocate of either polyandry or polygamy. One man for one woman, and one woman for one man, so long as the marriage bond exists, is what I advocate strenuously, and while we live under laws governing the matter, this should neither be entered into nor annulled without a public record being made in the proper legal way.

The foregoing remarks, relative to giving the unhappily married an opportunity for trying once and again until they have become satisfied with their choice, will no doubt sound very alarming to a class of well-meaning people who have had instilled into their minds, from infancy up, the idea that mankind are naturally almost totally depraved, and to be restrained from wickedness and brutishness only by a system of theological terror and laws framed and executed under the spirit of this system. Such will, no doubt, discover in their imagination a marriage to-day and a divorce of the parties a few weeks hence, when the passions have become in a degree sated, and other charmers have presented greater attractions.

And this leads us to the principal argument against the policy of easy divorce, namely, that it would lead to a general stampede from the matrimonial bond, and result in great licentiousness and general demoralization of the sexual relations. A similar fear and prediction were expressed by the Mother Church

when Protestantism contended for the right of individual thought; and it appears to me that the present ones are quite as uncalled for and untenable. Let me ask, is it the law, or is it mutual esteem and love, that holds together those who are happy in their marriage relations? Who is there, feeling that he or she has made a happy selection, who would not scorn the intimation that, were it not for the law, they would renounce their conjugal obligation?

But the advocate of ecclesiastical marriage may object still further and hold that the effect of such liberal divorce as I advocate would be disastrous upon *women*, as they would be abandoned when they became *faded* and *wrinkled*. On behalf of my sex, I deny with scorn the accusation that men in general are in anywise inclined, from any change of personal attractions which may have been wrought by age, to abandon or become faithless to the wives whom they have married for love, and whom they have found devoted and true.

There may be an occasional reprobate, like some of the patriarchs of old, who, in order that he might wed one younger and fairer, would put away a faithful wife with whom he had dwelt until both had become advanced in years, and she had become broken down and faded; but, *in heaven's name, tell me whether such a wife would not be infinitely better off by getting rid of such a base-hearted wretch?*

I cannot discover how marrying merely for the sake of gratifying the sexual passions would be likely to become more common under easy divorce than under the laws as they now stand. As they could not, under proper laws, avoid the maintenance of any

issue which might spring from the marriage relation, those who by nature might be brutal enough to marry merely for the indulgence of their passions would be likely, it would seem to me, to seek such gratification where there would be no danger of its being followed by any complications of this nature.

But, while I cannot discover that divorce laws as liberal as I advocate would be likely in any case to sever the bonds of a *true* marriage, or lead to licentiousness, I can see plainly how laws for the protection of indissoluble marriage furnish a direct and powerful incentive for dishonoring the marriage relations. Thousands and tens of thousands of marriages, in which love has no part, are contracted merely for the sake of wealth, of rank, or of title. The designing and crafty of both sexes weave their webs about such as are supposed or known to be the possessors of one or all these endowments, until the marriage benediction of the priest or magistrate has been pronounced, knowing that thereafter they cannot be shaken off, however much they may play the tyrant or virago, and that their privilege will then be, love or no love, to share in the honors and emoluments of those whom they have inveigled into legalized prostitution. It is not probable that such marriages would be entirely avoided were divorce to be made easy; but when, in order not to lose by divorce all they had gained by marriage, it should become necessary to keep up the deception of love, esteem, and good behavior *throughout life*, instead of only up to the wedding-day, it is plain that the number of this sort of unions would be greatly reduced. Holding to the bond for life those who have been in-

veigled into contracting such a marriage is certainly the rankest injustice.

But this marrying for wealth or rank, or anything short of mutual love and esteem, is an act which public sentiment must put its veto upon. Before this infamous and abominable custom will wholly cease, it must be stamped with that degree of odiousness and beastliness with which it is now invested by those who have an elevated view of marriage. When the fact once becomes generally recognized and pointed out that the woman who marries for any other object or consideration than love and esteem as assuredly sells her person as does her unfortunate sister in the house of ill-fame, there will be less scheming among ambitious dames, and marriage will be no longer dishonored by this sort of prostitution.

Probably no testimony that can be produced with regard to divorce can have greater weight with the Christian portion of the community than that given by the author of "Paradise Lost." Milton had had experience before writing upon the subject, and it is such who are best qualified to speak of the evils of unhappy marriage. In his Essay on Divorce, he says: "He who thinks it better to part than to live sadly and injuriously to that cheerful covenant (for not to be beloved and yet retained is the greatest injury to a gentle spirit); he, I say, who therefore seeks to part, is one who highly honors the married life and would not stain it; and the reasons which now move him to divorce are equal to the best of those that could first warrant him to marry. . . . The misinterpreting of scripture hath changed the blessings of matrimony not seldom into a familiar and

co-inhabiting mischief; at least into a drooping and disconsolate household captivite without refuge or redemption. . . . It is doubtless by the policy of the devil that this gracious ordinance of marriage sometimes becomes insupportable." Quite correct and sensible is Milton until he comes to touch upon the scriptural point, when he at once shows his bias. There is no "misinterpreting of scripture" about this matter, as the scriptures plainly command indissoluble marriage, except it be in case of adultery. But whether this be so or not, it is high time that we were freed from scriptural shackles in the regulation of social matters, and were guided instead by the enlightened reason of the age.

Now let us turn from *theory* to practice, for happily we have not a few examples afforded us which put this question as to the demoralization of society where liberal divorce laws are maintained beyond argument or speculative theory. The state of Indiana enacted a law some years since whereby her citizens could obtain a divorce upon proof of incompatibility of temper or general contrariety of character. Did this law cause that general stampede from the marriage union or the demoralization of the sexual relations which it is claimed must be the result of liberal divorce laws? We are compelled to admit that it did not. After a few years, when the unhappy alliances that stood at the door at the time the law was passed had been acted upon, affairs settled back into their normal condition, and divorce among the *native* population of Indiana was thereafter by no means frequent, while the morals of the people of the state have stood as high as in those

states that have held fast to ecclesiastical marriage. The same has been the result, too, in the other states adopting the same course.

Next let us glance for a moment at the other side of the picture. Let us turn our attention to a people whose marriages have been regulated by the church, and who for ages have lived under the cast-iron bond of indissoluble marriage. Southern Europe presents us an example of such a people; and nowhere in the civilized world do we find the marriage relations more lightly regarded; nowhere are concubinage and licentiousness more prevalent. Marriage in general among the people of Southern Europe is simply a matter of convenience to obtain some pecuniary or social end; love rarely being taken into the consideration. The wife is usually treated with politeness, but the husband's love is reserved for his mistress; while the idea that marriage should be regarded as any bar to promiscuous sexual intercourse is a matter for jest and ridicule. I will not attempt to go further in this direction, for these illustrations fully prove that the result of liberal divorce is the very opposite to that prophesied by the advocates of indissoluble marriage. It is not, then, liberal divorce but indissoluble marriage that demoralizes the sexual relations, belittles, dishonors, and degrades the marriage bond. It preserves the outward form, but that which constitutes *true marriage* is wanting wherever this cast-iron bond has been adhered to for any considerable length of time.

Indissoluble marriage, in the case of an unhappy alliance, may be summed up as compelling one of three things, namely, (1) prostitution through sexual inter-

course without love; (2) celibacy, or (3) adultery, which the law makes as crime.

Again, how much are we helped by the laws which, in some of our states, grant separation from "bed and board?" These, it is true, give to the wife the control of her person, which is no small consideration, and to that extent they are an improvement; but would it not be infinitely better to grant an absolute divorce to both parties where the alliance has become uncongenial? If marriage is the true state of existence for the sexes, why debar them of its privileges? Hardly as a punishment for having made a mistake, and yet I can discover no other reason. By a judicial separation they are not only deprived of all the advantages and joys of a true union, but they are placed in a position which naturally leads to crime and prostitution. Many a woman has brought up at last in a brothel, simply by not being able to obtain release from the bond of an unhappy marriage; and many a man has found his way to the same place for the same reason. This semi-divorce, then, though better than the attempt to enforce cohabitation, should be vigorously condemned, both from depriving the interested parties of the joys and privileges of a true marriage union, and from being a fruitful promoter of prostitution and crime.

Having now given the subject a careful examination I shall not hesitate to give it as my opinion that marriage should be a civil contract, dissoluble at will. It cannot be shown that the welfare of either the contracting parties, their offspring—should there be such—or the public at large, is promoted by holding the parties to their obligations when that which

constitutes true marriage no longer exists; while it has been shown in this chapter that much evil to all concerned is almost sure to follow such a course. The marriage contract should be something tangible, however—something about which there could be no chance for a mistake—and, like other important documents, it should be in writing, signed by the contracting parties, duly witnessed, and held as binding until dissolved by the court upon complaint and application of either husband or wife. This contract should be recorded in books kept for the purpose, which might easily be done at the offices where deeds and mortgages are registered. In case of divorce, the law should guard the dividing of property and the custody of children. The amount of property possessed by each should be specified in the contract, and at separation each should first be entitled to receive back the amount paid in, provided the property had been held intact, and their due proportions if otherwise, while all accumulations made while dwelling together under the marriage bond should be divided equally. The question as to how far each should contribute to the maintenance of any issue resulting from the marriage, would depend in part for settlement upon the amount of property possessed by each at the time of the divorce, and other considerations that might be shown, and which should be at the discretion of the court. In short, except in so far as guarding the rights of property is concerned, I see no reason why the mode adopted for governing the marriage relations in the New Republic, given at the commencement of this chapter, might not be substituted to advantage in lieu of our present imbecile,

immoral, ironclad covenant of ecclesiastical marriage, or anything pertaining to it.

It should be remembered that making marriage easily dissoluble compels no one to avail himself or herself of the privileges thus granted. Those who regard marriage as a sacrament, and are sufficiently superstitious to continue on in the unhallowed association when all that constitutes true marriage has departed, would not be deprived of their choice, though I apprehend that few such would be found when custom and the law had once opened an avenue for escape. What the advocates of liberal divorce object to and protest against is the forcing or tempting by the law those who have no such scruples into unnatural and beastly association. That marriage should be the most enduring of all contracts no well-meaning advocate of easy divorce will deny, but this should be insured by that love and esteem which alone constitutes marriage, and not by the restraining force of any law which merely turns marriage into prostitution.

Before closing this chapter, there are two other points that may be raised appropriately here. The first is the necessity for some check upon the increase of population, among a large portion of the community, at least, so long as the system of private property remains. I would say at the outset, however, that there would be no necessity for troubling our minds about the Malthusian doctrine, were we living under a properly devised industrial and property organization; but until mankind shall have attained to that happy state of existence, our endeavor should be to make existence now as tolerable as possible.

Under our present system of property, those who are deficient in means for supplying their natural wants are placed in a condition precisely parallel, as regards any further increase of offspring, to that of the collective inhabitants of the earth increased to such numbers that by the most strained effort the earth could not be made to produce in proportion to their wants; hence, under the present property system the necessity already arises—in fact, arose long since—for a check upon population among the poor, unless they are to exist as objects of charity. So, *with things as they are*, there is a necessity, and a powerful one too, for a check upon the increase of population among such as have not the means to insure the support of the beings whom they are responsible for bringing into the world.

Counseling this class to "increase and multiply" is about as pernicious as anything that can be easily imagined, and public opinion should set its face as a flint against such improvidence and recklessness. It is an awful responsibility to give life to a human being under our present system of property; and this should be so impressed upon every individual who has arrived at the age of puberty that they will not be very likely to forget it.

But you will tell me, perhaps, that the sexual passions are not always easily controlled. Very well; but if science could discover simple, harmless, and effective means for the prevention of conception, easily made available to all, then I claim that there is, or would be, no excuse for the bringing of children into the world by those whose incomes do not fully insure their support. I speak of such remedies only

as would *prevent* conception, as I do not approve of the attempt to destroy life when conception has once taken place. Were there no other objections, the danger to the mother is sufficient to condemn abortion.

Any superstition, however, that would oppose *prevention* would appear to me not only imbecile, but highly culpable, since the result of creating such a public sentiment, or sustaining one already created, would be the bringing of human beings into the world to drag out a miserable existence amid suffering, starvation, want, and misery.

Another evil which might be avoided, or greatly diminished at least, by this preventive check, would be the giving birth to offspring under physical or mental disabilities of parents, as well as the injurious effect upon the mother consequent upon too frequent child-bearing. Considering the evils which follow from excessive generation among the poor, and improper childbirth among all classes, it would seem to me that, in the interest of humanity, public sentiment should favor the knowledge and use of *preventives*, rather than denounce and endeavor to repress and conceal them. "But," says the stickler for "natural depravity," "were a knowledge of such preventions universal, there are but few women who would not become unchaste." Well, this is precisely in keeping with all the other arguments of those who see nothing naturally pure, good, and noble in either man or woman, and no doubt such unfortunate people really think that this result would follow. I confess that my equanimity gets disturbed sometimes by their many frivolous objections. Neither man nor woman,

in their opinion, can be trusted in anything, but must be hedged about by the law, and the theological constraints that took their rise in a barbarous age, or they will all be sure to rush headlong to destruction. But I hold a higher and nobler estimate than this of woman. I believe that in the main she herself sets too high an estimate upon her chastity, *for its own purity*, to sacrifice it, though her shame might be hidden from the world.

Would you make mankind better, then trust them, confide in their honor, unloose their shackles, give them liberty, let them stand up feeling as free men and women; then treat them justly, and we shall shortly find ourselves living in a new and more glorious world; we shall find in our fellow-beings a goodness and a nobleness of which we had little dreamed. Such being my views, I cannot regard with much complacency the assertion that the purity and chastity of our unmarried sisters and daughters depend upon a lack of knowledge for the hiding of their prostitution from the eyes of the world. And I doubt if such a thought would arise in the mind of any human being, except that he had been taught to regard mankind as nine-tenths satanic; or, that he himself is polluted through and through by his own lust.

The other matter spoken of, to which I now propose to allude briefly, has reference to that class of unfortunate females who take refuge in the houses of ill-fame—a class which even our boldest writers upon reform are apt to pass by in silence, regarding them, perhaps, as hopeless against any influence which they might be able to exert, or as without the

pale of human sympathy. What are these poor fallen ones, then? Are they human and deserving of our sympathy, or are they not? Go ask of the parents whose whitened locks, wasted forms, and dejected air betoken premature decay, and a sorrow which no pen can depict, if you would learn whether by nature some, at least, of these society-abandoned waifs were not as pure, as intelligent, and as lovable as the average of their species. They will tell you, quite likely, that as a child this poor fallen one was the brightest, the most affectionate, attractive, and beautiful of all their group. They will tell you, with choking, faltering speech, as the tears stream down their furrowed cheeks, how they stroked her flowing locks as she looked up into their smiling faces and prattled in the innocence of her childhood; how dutiful she was to her parents, how kind and affectionate to all, and how their hearts were lighted up with the brightest hopes for the happy future which appeared to await her. Then they will tell you the old, old story of misplaced love and confidence, man's treachery, her ruin and betrayal; the shame that followed, so unendurable that she could not look into the face of father, mother, brother, sister, or friend, and which drove her, at last, half distracted, to hide her disgrace in a brothel. Other parents will tell you again of one not less attractive, intelligent, kind, affectionate, who had contracted, as it was supposed, a happy marriage; but, when love had turned to loathing, esteem to disgust, a separation had taken place, and, being bound by law to the unnatural, obnoxious, and unholy alliance, and deprived from contracting one more congenial; de-

barred, therefore, from love, from home, and all of those society associates which go to make up so much of the life and happiness of woman, she, too, in a moment of despair and frenzy, had found her way to the house of ill-fame. These are the sad tales you may often hear from the parents; and then (if you are not too pure, too holy) enter the abode of some of these unfortunates, gain their confidence, and you may there listen to stories of sorrow, despair, and misery—true ones, too—that would melt a heart of stone. Hear how wretched to them has been found the life they have adopted, and what they would most willingly undergo and suffer if they could only be restored again to a life in which they might be respected and loved. But most affecting of all is the agony in which they speak of the loved ones at home; "father, mother, brothers and sisters," say they, "with lives blasted, made miserable from *my* misfortune, for it is my misfortune more than it is my wrong." And then the despair, the agony, that overwhelms them when confronted by the awful conviction that the step they have taken cannot be retraced nor its effects obliterated; when the fact stares them in the face that they have committed the unpardonable sin against society, and that henceforth shame, degradation, misery, and wretchedness are to be their inevitable portion, and, what is more terrible than all, that father, mother, brothers, and sisters must partake of their shame.

Such is the anguish, the remorse, and the repentance of many of these poor unfortunates when first they enter upon their wretched career. It is true that despair and loss of self-respect often harden

them in time into the coarsest, most unfeeling and shameless of wantons, and in this we have furnished us a most cogent example of the evil effect produced by the withdrawal of human sympathy.

You who would hedge every footstep of mankind around with the shackles of human law, learn from this that there is a power more potent by which they may be governed, and that power is sympathy and love. And you, most righteous, immaculate, and holy ones, who lend your influence to sustain that most inhuman and unrighteous public sentiment long since formed, which by ostracizing these fallen creatures virtually forbids their reclamation, have you ever reflected upon your own responsibility in this matter—your inhumanity? Yet, with all your mock holiness, were you to be asked to cast a stone at one of the poor fallen ones, if without sin, how many of you are there that would not feel like hiding your heads in shame?

Your sin may not be of the same character, but it may be one equally hideous, covered, however, by a veil which excludes it from public eye; and yet you dare assume the responsibility of treating with scorn and contempt those really little, if any, worse than yourselves. "But," say you, "should not unchastity meet with the disapproval of public sentiment?" Certainly, as should all other wrong, to an extent warranted by those who are themselves anything but immaculate. I have not intended to utter a word here that could be construed as, in any manner, lending my own approval to licentiousness or prostitution. On the contrary, I have endeavored, as far as was possible, in the brief manner with which the

subject has been treated, to depict truthfully the wretched condition in which the inmates of these brothels, when it is too late, find themselves placed. What I do vigorously protest against, however, is that the false step taken by the poor unfortunate, who in her fall probably has been the *victim* far more than the *doer* of evil, and who has been driven in a moment of despair and frenzy to take up her abode in a house of ill-fame, should be singled out from among all other evils as an unpardonable offense against society; that society should refuse to condone her wrong; should bar their door against her reclamation. Is society itself so immaculate that it can afford to take upon itself such a responsibility? Shall a community that calls itself Christian take upon itself the prerogative of deity, so far as to pronounce an offense against its sense of propriety an *unpardonable sin*, and visit upon it such high-handed punishment!

Shame upon the influence and heartlessness that dare assume such a prerogative and inflict such inhumanity!

Would you ask, "How may these poor, fallen victims of wrong be reclaimed?" I will venture an answer to this question: First form yourselves into a society; then go, *wives* and *matrons*, and seek them in their ill-famed abodes; present to them hearts overflowing with sympathy and love; make them see and feel that you are deeply interested in their welfare, then show them the way, and offer to them the means for escape.

You may not be able to prevail upon all, for some, from long association with the vices that have sur-

rounded them, have become too hardened to desire a change; but many will hail you as divine harbingers offering to them again a glorious existence which they had looked upon as forever lost.

"But," say you, "when the object of our visits became known, admission to the brothels would probably be denied us." Advertise the rooms of your society, then, in every journal in your city, and if this be not sufficient, get out hand-bills and posters showing where your society meet. A little energy would give prominence and publicity enough to such a society to reach the eye or ear of all these unfortunates, and though the effect would be hardly equal, probably, to that of being allowed admission and seeking them in their own abodes, yet those eager for escape (and few are not at the commencement of their career, only that they see no way afforded them) would be likely to find you, and the good you might thus do can hardly be overestimated. I hear you ask, "What inducement could we hold out to them that they might again be received into society and become respected; and what would be the further manner of procedure?" Those who were educated sufficiently to become teachers I would, when possible, procure schools for in places far remote from their nativity and acquaintanceship; those not sufficiently educated for teachers, places might be procured for as factory operatives or as domestics.

You say, perhaps, that "there is so much passing to and fro over the land that at times they would be recognized and exposed." This would no doubt occasionally happen, but only occasionally, and such

an objection certainly should not stand in the way of the much good which might be derived from so noble an effort; besides, the biped who would thus expose a woman who was endeavoring to reclaim her character, to establish for herself a good name again among her kind, should be made to feel by the force of public sentiment the detestableness of his interference. "But," you say once more, "would you dare trust this class again and feel warranted in recommending them as teachers, factory operatives, or domestics?" To which I answer, that were it not their intent to reform and lead respectable lives they would not renounce the situations in which they were living; therefore, when this had once been done, I say emphatically yes, I would trust them, and recommend them cheerfully and confidently, feeling the assurance that not one time out of a thousand would my confidence be abused.

Again say you, "We are not told as yet how these poor lost ones are to be restored to father, mother, and friends." I may be the most reckless of mortals, but, believing fully in my theory of trusting mankind, confiding in them to make them better, I will tell you what I should do even in this case, which I confess the *most* difficult of all.

When one of these unfortunates had been employed for a term of years in some such vocation as named above, and had behaved herself in a respectable and becoming manner, should the love of home, of parents, brothers, sisters, and friends, prove so powerful as to influence her to return again to the scenes of her childhood, when she came back broken and bowed down in heart, as came the prodigal son to

his father, were I a resident of the community, I would myself seek her out quickly, and extend to her that sympathy of which she was deserving; and not only this, but I would beg of my wife and daughters to do the same.

Let me ask, in conclusion, what sense, justice, or humanity there is in a public sentiment that condemns to a life of endless shame and degradation the unfortunate victim who, through love and confidence, has tripped and fallen, while her betrayer does not even lose caste in the slightest degree, but is welcomed, courted, and often honored, in the most respectable society? I myself once knew of an instance where the betrayer of one of the most beautiful, intelligent, affectionate, and lovely of young women, held his position as superintendent of a Sunday school, whose society was courted and who was regarded as one of the most influential and respectable of the community in which he resided, while his victim had been driven by her shame to take up her residence in a house of ill-fame.

Shame, a thousand times shame, upon that public sentiment that sanctions such injustice; that casts without the pale of humanity into a life of degradation and misery the *victim*, while the *seducer* is respected, honored, and sometimes, it would seem, the more courted from the success of his amours.

CHAPTER XII.

LIFE IN THE NEW REPUBLIC.

HAVING now dwelt upon some of the more important phases in which the lives and conduct of the people in the New Republic presented themselves to me, I would in this chapter take the reader with me to their homes, and point out some of the minor details respecting the customs, vocations, amusements, recreations, etc., that went to make up the daily lives of these contented and happy mortals.

Let us enter first the community-home in the city, and observe the usual routine of a day. The hour for breakfast was at 7 o'clock, from April 1st to November 1st, and at 7:30 during the remainder of the year, the meal occupying but half an hour. Directly following this, each adult, male and female, began their several occupations, which continued until 12 in the summer and 12:30 in the winter. A half hour being given to reach the place of employment, this gave four full hours for labor, which was all that was required. These were the usual hours for manual labor, but some, of course, were engaged in pursuits which required their presence at other hours—those, for instance, occupied in manning the railroads, steamboats, telegraph and postal communication, etc. Yet these, as a rule, were required to be at their posts only the four hours daily, being

relieved of continuous and excessive toil by adequate help.

The time for manual labor having expired, all returned for dinner, which was ready punctually at 1 o'clock. The children of suitable age, in the mean time, had been occupied at the schools. Meals were served in one large room, arranged with tables that would seat from four to twelve, families occupying a table by themselves if they preferred. The time allotted to dinner was one hour, and usually a jolly hour it was, too. The labors of the day being over, the mind was at ease; a satisfaction was felt by all that each had done his share toward providing for his physical wants; the body had been strengthened, the appetite made keen and the mind clear, by their labors; they had a good dinner before them, good society around them, and why should not each and all be happy? At this meal light wines were used in moderation by the elder members of the household; the incidents of the day were talked over, anecdotes related, and every effort made to make the daily fête a gladsome hour.

The tables were spread with the whitest of linen, and usually decorated with flowers; the serving was systematic and prompt, and the cooking of the first order. The cooks thought their calling quite equal to that of the magistrates, and were not far from correct. The service of the house was performed by the wives and daughters of the household, assisted by the younger male portion, who served by turns at the tables.

After dinner the men retired to the piazzas, the parlors, and the smoking-room, while the tables were

being cleared and the dishes washed up, which duties were quickly performed, as all the ladies of the household joined in and did their share. This over, until 6:30—except for a few of the women who a little before the hour for that meal took their turns about preparing the supper—the time was spent by all in the manner most pleasing to them.

Some read, some conversed, some debated; others listened to music in the parlors or on the piazzas; some repaired to Science Hall to study and experiment; some to the libraries; some rode either on horseback or in carriages; others went to the playgrounds to participate in games and gymnastic exercises; others, again, rowed or sailed. And so all amused themselves according to their taste or inclination.

At 6:30 all returned to a light supper without meat or wines. After supper many retired to the parlors for an hour's musical entertainment; some smoked, while others chatted on the piazzas or in the reading-room. At about eight some went to the theaters, some to the lecture-rooms, some to concerts, some to libraries, some remained in the reading and billiard rooms, and others played instrumental music, sang, danced, and chatted in the parlors. Between ten and eleven they came in from the theaters, lecture-rooms, etc., and at eleven all had retired to rest, the lights were out, and the house was closed for the night.

Having thus rapidly sketched the doings of a day in order that I might the more systematically connect them for the benefit of the reader, let us now take up some of the more prominent features of

life, as it existed in the New Republic, and present them more in detail.

First, in regard to the labors of the day, to which all hastened with alacrity as a pleasure that none would forego—different, indeed, from the anxious, careworn, haggard, overworked merchant, clerk, and artisan who may now be seen every morning wending their way down the city much as the galley slave goes to his oar. The industrial pursuits in the cities were mostly commercial, the organization of which having been given in the chapter upon Commerce, it remains only to point out the routine here.

The Superintendent of Commerce, with the faculty of a Stewart for organization, was ever promptly at his post, and the labors of the day were promptly begun. As the correspondence with Commerce Hall was of course large, when the mail was received the letters were opened by the superintendent's assistant, the more important, requiring the special attention of the superintendent, laid upon his desk, and the rest were sent to their several departments for prompt attention. Under a system wherein one price invariably ruled; in a country where all manufactured wares were honestly made, and where personal inspection was, therefore, not required, there was nothing to prevent the great bulk of all commercial business being done through orders; and so it was done. These orders were promptly placed in the proper hands for execution; vessels were laden and dispatched to foreign republics, as well as home ports; commodities of all sorts were taken from the warehouses and forwarded to the inland cities, or to the communities within the city's precinct, while

invoices of all were promptly forwarded by post. It was not necessary to look up references, consult mercantile agencies, or rack one's brains generally to decide upon the responsibility of the purchaser, but all orders from every portion of the globe were promptly filled, in confidence that a due course of post would bring the proper remittance. Orders for commodities were made out and forwarded to the different ports of the foreign republics, and manufacturers within the precinct of the city were notified if their stocks in the warehouses required replenishing, while a statement of such of their products as had been sold was sent them quarterly and the money due them remitted. And so all went on as smoothly as clock-work, with perhaps not more than a one-hundredth part of the number engaged in transacting the commercial business of the Republic that are occupied for that purpose at the present day.

The agricultural department of the city had also its superintendent, under whom its functions worked as smoothly as did those of the commercial department, and vegetable gardening was carried on to such an extent as to supply quite a large portion of the home consumption. Such mechanical operations as the necessities of the city required were also quite as successfully prosecuted in proper localities; but manufacturing, in the main, was carried on only among the country communities.

In every household was a large room assigned to the purpose of making the clothing for both sexes. This was woman's work, which she cheerfully accepted, and all the garments of each household were made by the ladies comprising its circle. There,

during the hours of labor, might ever be heard the click of the sewing-machine rising up amid the chatter of merry voices as they told stories, joked, and bantered each other while contentedly pursuing their occupations. How different were all these from the poor, half-famished, scantily-clothed, anxious, care-worn, overworked millions of the better and more deserving portion of our race who are to-day crowded into ill-ventilated, unwholesome rooms, or in some damp cellar or dingy garret, plying their several vocations, and stitching away, many of them still upon "a shroud as well as a shirt."

Dress in the New Republic varied in different climates, and in latitudes where the climate was subject to great change. The lighter and looser garments were in vogue in the warmer climates, also during the summer in cooler ones, while heavier, warmer garments were adopted in such for winter. The *style* of dress, however, in the several latitudes, was *uniform;* and not only this, but the ingredient and quality were the same among all, except in cases where the occupation was of a nature extremely destructive to the garment, when a coarser, more enduring material was used. In such cases, however, when the labors of the day were over, the coarser garments were doffed and replaced by such as were worn by the rest. The style of dress had been studied with care, and was really becoming to all ages and every stature. The dress of the sexes differed; and here, perhaps, a description of both might be naturally looked for; but as I pay little attention to dress, I hardly feel competent to venture a description, and must confine myself to merely what I

can recollect—which is, that neither stovepipe hats nor long-tailed dresses were in order.

Let us now turn our attention to the manner in which the time of the people was spent when not engaged in manual labor. And he who imagines that such time was frittered away idly, foolishly, or unprofitably, let me say, makes the greatest of mistakes. During the afternoons and evenings, in which, as a rule, the time of every one belonged to himself, except at intervals for recreation and amusement all devoted themselves to some specialty by which they hoped to accomplish something that might be of benefit to their kind, and by which, if possible, they might distinguish themselves. I have already, in the chapter on Education, spoken of the alacrity with which some of the more aspiring made their way to Science Hall in the afternoons and evenings for study and experiment; and here, perhaps, as it has been heretofore neglected, it would be as well to give the reader a more detailed description of the inner arrangement of this building and the purposes to which it was devoted. In it was one immense lecture-room used for all sorts of public gatherings, and beside this three other halls of smaller dimensions, and yet what we should now call quite large, together with an additional hall for amateur theatrical performances. The magistrate and council's office, offices for the Treasury Department, and the office of the Bureau of Statistics were also in this building. And a word here concerning this Bureau of Statistics. It was the duty of the Secretary of each community to make and forward to the Bureau of Statistics annually at the commencement of the year a brief and compre-

hensive statement of the condition of the community, its size, the general health of its members during the year just ended; their pursuits, whether agricultural or mechanical, or both; what were the products and their extent—in short, whatever was important that might be of general interest or benefit, and particularly whether the community would be likely to be benefited by either an increase or decrease of its population. These reports were printed in pamphlet form by the Bureau of Statistics for general distribution. One great benefit arising from these reports was that through them information was furnished to those who from any cause, whether on account of health, climate, or for other reasons, were desirous of changing their habitations. Whenever this desire was felt, all were free to act as suited their inclinations, and were provided with letters that secured them a welcome admittance into any community not already overpopulated.

But to return to Science Hall. The remainder of the building, except as stated above, was devoted to scientific pursuits and was divided into lecture and study rooms, furnished with everything requisite for experimenting in the various branches of science. The scientific pursuits had their devotees among those employed in the forenoon in nearly every branch of manual labor. They came here from Commerce Hall, the warehouses, the different trades, and the garden, and the gardener was quite as apt to be proficient in his scientific pursuits as were any of the others. Science Hall was indeed the chief attraction for many of the master spirits of the communities, and there, engrossed in the pursuit of their

several hobbies, when not engaged in manual labor, the present and future scientists of mark might usually be found.

Then came mechanical inventions, to utilize the discoveries which were constantly being made by science, and through which incalculable benefits were conferred upon the race. Literature, too, had her host of votaries. To place before the public at large, in an interesting and condensed shape, that knowledge of nature and her laws which science had been successful in discovering; to sift out and condense in comprehensive form from the vast treasure-house of history, such information as was likely to be the most advantageous to the present and coming generations; to instruct and improve mankind through philosophical and ethical treatises; to illustrate human nature in works of the imagination, and to mount up in poetical imagery to the embodiment of that highest ideal of which the finite mind is capable—to attempt all such undertakings, I say, then, as now, possessed a charm for the more aspiring minds of the age.

High Art, too, was there, and to this a no less enthusiastic number were devoted. In an age when every community village was adorned and made charmingly attractive by works of art; when beautiful paintings decorated the inner walls of every domicile, while the surrounding grounds were embellished by statues of a no less meritorious character, the attention which High Art commanded may be readily imagined.

Music, also, had its host of enthusiastic followers. So highly was music appreciated, and so much did

it contribute to the enjoyment of the race, that its cultivation in some form by every individual was regarded as indispensable.

Thus we see what a vast field lay open in these higher branches of education to occupy the passing hours of every human being when not engaged in manual labor. All, perhaps, might not be producers to any very marked extent in these various fields of knowledge, but most could contribute in some degree, at least, to their advancement, and all certainly were partakers, in an almost incalculable measure, of the advantages, the pleasures, and the happiness which were derived therefrom. Think, now, reader, how immeasurably above that sordid, debasing desire and straining for wealth or political distinction which now engross almost the entire family of man, was this aspiration, this effort which in the New Republic was made by all according to their qualifications to instruct, improve, and ennoble mankind through the medium of a higher education. It may be readily seen that in the New Republic there was inducement sufficient for all to qualify themselves for acting well their part in life; and opportunity for so occupying their leisure hours as to prevent any portion of it hanging heavily.

Another method adopted in the New Republic for the purpose of instruction and improvement was the institution known as the Lyceum, or Debating Club. Somewhat popular with us, this was exceedingly so with them. The Debating Club was, in fact, as universal as the schools, there not being a community household upon the face of the globe in which this means of improvement was not put in constant prac-

tice. There was no other cause equal to this, they said, for bringing out and developing the intellectual faculties. The finest talent, they claimed, was usually hid beneath a veil of modesty, and, oftentimes, of extreme timidity. This talent, they said, must be brought out in some manner, or be lost to the world, and a class of brazen-faced jackanapes, with a modicum of brain power, come to the front and rule. Wrapped in the sensitive temperament in which this native talent exists, it requires wise and delicate handling, and youth, they contended, was the time for guiding its footsteps and gradually instilling into its possessor that confidence which was necessary for its full development. Through the debate this confidence was soon obtained, and the young became enabled to put their thoughts into language and utter their ideas in the presence of others. Not only with the young, either, was the potency of this discipline found beneficial, but those of every age received the highest benefit from this perpetual training, as the faculty of uttering one's thoughts fluently, lucidly, and concisely can never be allowed to rest without becoming in a measure dormant. Moreover, the debate not only sharpened up the wits, but it led also to the study of the subject under consideration, and thus much information gained by each was imparted to all present. The Debating Club, therefore, was one of the cherished institutions of the age. It was held regularly two evenings in each week by every community household, and besides these meetings matches were often formed by choosing one or two from each of several households for discussions, which always excited great interest and drew crowded

houses. Nearly all of both sexes participated in these debates.

The younger portion debated together apart upon subjects given them suitable to their age. The first attempts were of course a trying ordeal for the timid, but they gained confidence as they went on, and it often proved the case that the most timid were the best in debate when their timidity had worn off. Only a few words were required of them at first, and their blunders were never laughed at, but they were encouraged in every possible manner.

Such was the Debating Club; and would that it were more encouraged and made more popular and general throughout our land to-day; for its benefits are not confined, as many suppose, to those only who are preparing themselves for some profession which requires public speaking, but are felt in our every-day conversations and in every department of life; besides, I hold that every intelligent human being should be capable of acquitting himself fairly, at least, in addressing a concourse of people, should occasion require, as there is little doubt that by a proper preparation in youth this faculty may be acquired by all.

Another charming custom prevalent in the New Republic, and which might be considered perhaps as a sort of adjunct to the debate, was the practice of holding general conversations daily upon some given subject, one person only, however, being allowed to speak at a time. These conversations were held regularly at 4 P. M., either on the garden lawn, the piazzas, or, when the weather was inclement, in the drawing-rooms. Nothing, except the Debating Club,

interested me more than these assemblages of a goodly portion of the household gathered around the magistrate, who usually presided, with wits well sharpened up and cheeks aglow with excitement, to take a part in these colloquies which were adding still more to the already well-filled storehouses of knowledge. The subject having been previously given out, each was now at liberty to make a few laconic remarks, or to ask a question bearing upon the subject of the magistrate or any other person present. This led quickly to a spirited conversation, each rising and speaking in parliamentary order as recognized by the chairman; but when a question was asked, the interlocuted was always expected to make an immediate reply. In this way all were usually brought into the colloquy. These conversations were also exceedingly efficacious in imparting confidence and bringing forth the reserved and timid, as well as in arousing individual thought. When useful information was imparted, or a particularly bright or witty remark was made, the speaker was heartily applauded. But what struck me as particularly notable was the respect with which were received expressions of opinion averse to the conventional ideas held in regard to any subject.

Public sentiment decidedly favored the broadest latitude being given to free speech, free thought, and the free expression of opinion in all forms, it having long before been made manifest that this was the true road to knowledge and progress. "To stifle these," they said, "was to kill the goose that laid the golden egg."

Crude, therefore, as any theory might appear when

first advanced, it was received with decorum and given respectful consideration; in short, every encouragement was given to the utterance in any respectful form of independent thought. When new or not commonly accepted ideas were advanced, they were met, of course, with such argument as could be brought against them, but always with the most considerate bearing toward the one by whom they had been advanced. The argument might be criticised and even handled severely, but no personalities or anything offensive was ever indulged in toward those who advocated change, however radical, from the preconceived opinions or belief.

How different in the past and present the method of meeting declarations of individual thought running counter to that currently expressed! The masses of mankind little realize to what extent progress has been retarded through the customary tyrannical methods of repressing individual thought.

For exercising the right of free expression in the past, millions have been maltreated, tortured, and put to death upon the scaffold, at the stake, and in many other forms; and though such heterodoxy is no longer attended with corporeal punishment, yet the same tyranny still prevails in other forms, and is followed by very disastrous results. The speaker or writer who to-day gives expression to thoughts, opinions, theories, or belief, radically different from the popular sentiment, is likely to be abused without stint, ridiculed, blackguarded, and socially ostracized. Those who may never have given an hour's serious thought to the subject feel at liberty to pronounce his opinions crude, absurd, and ridiculous.

A vast number of people in the world know all that is worth knowing, or ever will be worth knowing; and to such, of course, all that does not coincide with their opinions or beliefs must be the silliest rodomontade or the most empty delusion. It is this spirit, so prevalent, that is the evil genius of individual thought in the world. He who loves approbation more than he loves his fellow-men is not apt to venture far in a path so thorny. Knowing what would be the punishment for their offending, the timid, those who have little self-reliance, are as effectually squelched as was Servetus by the all-knowing, dogmatic John Calvin, or as thousands of others have been crushed for daring to oppose public sentiment. When society has learned to treat with respect and proper consideration, and has begun to encourage, the expression of individual opinion, however much it may clash with the preconceived opinions or beliefs of the age, then, and not until then, will the shackles be unloosed from knowledge, and progress become rapid in the world.

Reading among such a people as that of the New Republic was, of course, one of the chief occupations to fill up the leisure hours of all. The libraries were resorted to in the afternoons and evenings by many, while others took books to their rooms for perusal.

Now, a few words as to their amusements and recreations. The theaters were large and commodious, well-appointed in every particular, and were always well patronized. The theater had indeed come to be regarded as one of the choicest institutions of the age. Mankind had become fully aware that one of the chief means of happiness consisted in

being often amused and instructed. The theater having, therefore, become fully appreciated, great effort was made to sustain it with the highest order of talent. The plays partook of comedy more generally, however, than at the present day. Occasionally a tragedy of Shakspere's, some of the great French dramatists, or one of more modern date was presented, but they did not appear to meet the tastes of the people; they wanted something more amusing and instructive, and not so horrible. The tragedies of Shakspere they regarded as having been highly overdrawn and unnatural, as they could not comprehend how it were possible for mankind to have ever been so brutal as these plays would seem to represent them. To write a good comedy was an achievement conferring high honor upon its author, and to represent the characters well upon the stage was regarded as equally commendable. Amateur theatrical performances were given nearly every evening at the room devoted to that purpose in Science Hall, in which many of the younger portion of the community and often some of the elder portion took a part.

The museum was likewise a great place of resort, especially for those coming in from the country, as here were gathered together the relics of antiquity back to the most remote ages. The relics of warfare, here to be found, embracing a sample of every known instrument of the camp, barrack, fort, field, or ship, were examined with the greatest interest by those who had never seen anything of the kind before, and such was the case with all upon their first visit to the city. War was now known to mankind only through history, and it was almost impossible for them to realize that

human beings had ever been so brutal as to turn these terrible weapons of destruction upon one another. War was known no more, and well might our descendants shudder and their cheeks burn with shame as they gazed upon these terrible instruments of warfare and realized from what an ancestry they had sprung.

A great feature of recreation in the New Republic was riding, both in vehicles and on horseback, the latter being much in vogue. Everybody, almost, rode on horseback—old, young, and middle-aged. A centenarian, riding out on Grand avenue, on horseback, was no uncommon sight, and when the weather was inclement they might be seen among, perhaps, a thousand, galloping in good style around the big ring in the riding academy. Each community-dwelling had its stable, and horses and vehicles sufficient for the accommodation of the household. Racing tracks, however, had gone entirely out of vogue, as they regarded the treatment which horses there receive as inhuman and useless. They taught their horses many kinds of tricks, and some of them seemed so intelligent that they might almost have been thought to be reasoning beings.

Ball playing and many other out-door sports were popular, but since manual labor had become universal, there was not the need as now for artificial gymnastic exercises. Billiards, however, were played much by both sexes, together with many other indoor games.

A charming custom strictly observed in the New Republic, and which contributed in a wonderful measure to the happiness, the delight, and the in-

telligence of the people, was the opportunity given for travel. All at the age of from eighteen to twenty, or at the close of their scholastic term, had two years granted them in which to journey over the globe. This was the completion of their education, except so far as they might afterwards voluntarily pursue the course which had now been marked out for them, and to this all youthful hearts looked forward in blissful hope and expectation, which was seldom followed by disappointment. It was not a privilege granted them provided "friends and fortune smiled," as in our day, but a privilege granted freely to all, and the means for its successful realization was always at their disposal. The public conveyances were at their service all over the wide earth, the hospitality of the several communities gave them a welcome reception, supplied their wants bountifully while they remained with each, and furnished them with all the information possible for making their further journeyings pleasant and profitable. Provision was constantly made in every community household for strangers—strangers no longer when they had once crossed the threshold—and so there might be seen parents in New York entertaining the children of parents in Pekin, Melbourne, London, or Buenos Ayres, some of whom, at the same moment, perhaps, were exerting themselves to make happy the children of these New York parents, now in one of these far-distant lands. What a power was here for the enlightenment of mankind and for making and preserving the whole world akin. Constantly these youths were graduating and going out to traverse every portion of the earth; reaping delight,

gaining information and knowledge, treasuring up wisdom, and cementing together the race in one universal brotherhood, which served to make existence upon the earth a perpetual joy.

Now, let us turn our attention for a moment to such pursuits, recreations, and amusements, as were carried on in the agricultural and manufacturing communities, and not common alike to both city and country life.

Here, as we have found was the case in the cities, and as we behold it in the universe, order was the first great law. No confusion reigned, but everything was systematized and went on harmoniously. In their agricultural pursuits the workmen were divided into bands, at the head of each being one who was to direct. The magistrate assisted by his council laid the plans; each of the council took charge of one of the bands of workmen; if more foremen were required they were selected from among the rank and file, and each band proceeded to their labors marshaled as mankind were wont in former days to take the field to mutilate and slay. Horses and oxen had been fed and were in readiness, implements had been piled into wagons and carts, and, the morning meal finished, directly the workmen jump in and off they go to the several fields, singing as merrily as the birds.

In the manufacturing department usually connected with every agricultural community, the same order reigned. As there was usually but one kind of manufacturing carried on in any one community, nearly all became so far proficient in this, as well as in the agricultural pursuits, that they could turn their

hand readily from one to the other. Change was therefore made from the factory to the farm and *vice versa*, as it might conduce to the health or pleasure of each, such change not being found difficult or damaging to the interests of the community.

At midday the labors of the day were over, and all returned to the community home for dinner. Their afternoons and evenings were spent in a similar manner to that of the dwellers in the cities, except that they were deprived of a few privileges and enjoyed others not practicable to both.

The principal advantages in the city of which the dwellers in the country were deprived was Science Hall, the theaters, and the opera. However, such as showed a decided ambition for scientific pursuits had the opportunity granted them for going to the cities to prosecute these studies; and in lieu of the theaters and opera the dwellers in the country had their amateur theatricals and musical entertainments, which afforded them much enjoyment; besides, the cities where the theaters and opera were located were not so remote but all could frequently attend them.

As an offset to these, however, they had also some advantages more readily at their command. Among these was angling, which afforded not only a favorite pastime, but also a highly esteemed article of diet. In portions of the country adapted to the breeding of the speckled trout, the trout pond was to be found within the precinct of every community in which the natural facilities rendered the undertaking practicable. The youth, the middle-aged, and the silver-haired old man all took exquisite delight in casting

the fly for the "speckled beauties," and well they might, for few are the recreations allotted to mankind out of which they may extract so much genuine pleasure. I abhor vagabonds in the main, but confess to a sympathy with the shiftless ragamuffin who has become so absorbed in the rod and reel that life has no other attractions for him.

It may appear strange that, while fishing had become so prominent a feature of recreation in the New Age, hunting, on the contrary, had become extremely unpopular; nevertheless such was the fact. This may have arisen in part from the fact that, while it was generally conceded that fish constituted a natural and wholesome aliment for the use of mankind, many were of the opinion that this did not hold true of other animal food. But whatever may have been the cause of the change, the senseless and foolhardy custom of galloping over the fields, scaling fences and ditches, reckless of life and limb, in pursuit of a frightened little fox, or of a timid hare, no longer remained in vogue. Since the abominable custom of mankind murdering each other and calling it war had become extinct, man had shown less cruelty in his treatment of animals.

Many other minor details of life in the New Republic might be given, but the writer proposes leaving it now to the imagination of the reader to supply the deficiency. The object throughout this work has been only to furnish a general outline of future life in the Republic, leaving it to the reader to fill in the interstices, which he trusts, from the groundwork that has now been given, will not be found difficult.

To assist the reader in so doing let us briefly recap-

itulate. We have seen—where all before was haphazard, disorder, and confusion—the improvements which man had brought about upon the earth for the betterment of his condition through a well-devised and systematic plan, out of which arose order, harmony, beauty, comfort, and a thousand other blessings.

We have seen the huge and unsightly cities crowded with a thousand redundant appendages, metamorphosed into gardens of salubrity and beauty, while their utility has been incalculably augmented. We have seen the half-cultivated fields and barren wastes throughout our land made to produce exuberantly by an organization of industry, and at the same time so beautified and adorned that the earth has been made to literally "blossom as the rose."

In the function of government we have seen the coercive system of law turned into a more efficacious rule through advice, sympathy, persuasion, kindliness, love; the wisest and best selected by the people to counsel together and direct, with the rest following their directions as a dutiful son would follow the counsels of a loved father.

For the purpose of exchanging the commodities of the world we have seen the folly of wasting an incalculable amount of labor to procure from the earth a mineral substance upon which to confer an arbitrary value that it might represent these commodities, when an article always at our command and costing almost nothing to produce would answer the purpose equally well.

We have seen all public improvements in the hands of the public, where they properly belong, and

the public, through their chosen officers, conducting them in the most economical, efficacious, and proper manner. We have seen the distribution of commodities managed by the same agency, which had also a general supervision over production, and all running on smoothly, almost without a ripple.

We have seen, moreover, that the burden cast upon the masses of mankind through imbecile finance, indiscriminate public improvements, an ill-devised and ill-conducted system of distribution and commerce, as well as of agricultural and mechanical production, is so stupendous as to defy all human calculation or conception.

We have seen such opportunities and facilities for the cultivation of the mind as would alone transform an ignorant people into a people of intelligence and wisdom.

We have seen mankind emancipated, freed from superstition, and rejecting all theological creeds and dogmas; and yet so regulating their conduct that existence upon the earth was a joy indeed.

We have seen humanity unwilling to be guided in their marital relations by ecclesiastical bigotry; unwilling, also, to prostitute themselves by continuing the marital relation when that *love* which alone constitutes true marriage no longer existed.

And, finally, from the several causes arising out of our new property system, we have seen the condition of man improved beyond expression—the rich saved from *ennui* and the many attendant ills consequent upon an unnatural and abnormal life; the middle class saved from anxiety, care, overwork, and wounded pride; the poor raised from their drudgery and des-

titution to comfort and the enjoyments of life; all saved from vice and crime, while innumerable evils were replaced by countless blessings.

Moreover, *honor* in the New Republic was not won by securing great possessions; by outwitting and outstripping our fellow-men; nor by clambering over the dead and dying to wrench victory and the soldier's wreath from a fallen foe, and that foe our human brothers; neither still by ranting vigorously in the halls of state in behalf of some new patch to be botched on to a system which, if ever commendable, is now seedy and threadbare and has long outlived its age and usefulness. Not for these achievements were men honored in the New Republic; but honors there were conferred in proportion as each assiduously cultivated the moral and intellectual faculties, and was most successful in turning his abilities toward the uplifting and benefiting of his fellow-men. He who grappled with the powers of nature and wrested from them such knowledge as might be of benefit to his race, or who rendered similar service in the departments of literature, the fine arts, mechanical inventions or improvements, or was, in short, in any manner prominent in conferring blessings upon humanity, had his due share of honor meted out to him.

It was to do their duty, that life might thus be made brighter and happier for all, themselves included, that men strove in the New Republic; and then, if special honors came, they were appreciated, but they did not trespass in any manner upon the rights or happiness of their fellow-beings in order to secure them.

In the New Republic one fact had become demonstrated which, perhaps, most men would be loth to admit at the present day. This was that but a trifling difference will exist in the intellectual capacities and moral propensities of mankind when born and reared under conditions that are in a great measure equal. At the age to which I refer, long antecedent ages of correct living had produced a race of beings who imparted to their offspring sound bodies and sound minds; the conditions of parentage, therefore, had become in a far greater measure equal, and when such a result had been reached the differences, intellectually and morally, were found to be insignificant.

In a community wherein the nobler faculties of mankind were continually and powerfully stimulated to action, both ignorance and vice could find a sorry welcome. It would be almost impossible to remain ignorant or to become dissolute among such a race of beings. The people of whom we are speaking did not lay claim to absolute moral rectitude, but those evils which are now denominated crimes certainly no longer existed. Errors there still were, but they were errors of judgment, not of intent. Removing the chief cause of crime—private property—had proved successful in removing crime itself.

Nor had the advance of man been much less physically than intellectually and morally. From each performing their due share of manual labor, and from the many thus being relieved of inordinate physical exertion and those mental anxieties and perplexities which now attend upon the struggle to obtain a livelihood; from inheriting sound bodies and sound

minds, instead of those mental, moral, and physical disabilities which now work such incalculable harm; a race of beings had sprung up upon the earth that in physical development were far beyond the present prevailing conception of the possibilities of man. Sickness was rarely known, and, unless cut off by accident, they lived until they had passed their century or more of years, then dropped off as drops the autumn leaf back to the lap of Mother Earth.

And now, reader, try to form some faint conception —for this is all that can be done by the most highly imaginative—of the unutterable joys which such a life presents. Think of passing one's period of years upon the earth in the society of such a race of beings. Think of the sorrows and miseries to be escaped and the joys and happiness to be realized. No longer this indescribable struggle among the masses to provide for the physical wants of existence while a few surfeit upon their ill-gotten gains, but all sharing equally and abundantly in that which exuberant Nature properly cultivated so profusely bestows. No few tyrannizing over the many through coercive law or ecclesiastical despotism, but mankind being wisely and effectually governed by that most potent of all ruling powers, Love. No longer this tremendous struggle for individual aggrandizement at the expense of our fellows, but in its place the noble endeavor of all to improve themselves and benefit the race.

In the community of which I speak all met and mingled upon terms of equality, thus conferring upon all, to an unexampled extent, such knowledge and benefits as they had derived from the pursuit of

their several vocations. The great scientist, author, artist, or inventor did not hold himself in any manner above those less learned, or those occupied in the more menial employments; but mingled as freely and unreservedly with the farmer or artisan as with those of his own or any of those callings which would now be considered as more dignified; in fact, as I have pointed out, it was not seldom the case that those engaged in some of these more menial occupations themselves stood far up in some of the higher branches of knowledge. Whether this was the case or not, however, it made no difference in the intermingling of society, as the principle which actuated all was to lift up, as far as practical, those who might be in any respect inferior to themselves.

When such a principle as this is recognized and put into practice, what may not then be expected of humanity? Truly, there would be no measuring its possibilities.

Will anyone say now that all this is but the wild and "baseless fabric of a dream"—another unattainable Utopia that can have no further existence than in the imagination? Would you argue, because dreams similar to what I have shadowed forth here so imperfectly have been dreamed and given to the world before, but yet remain only dreams, that this is conclusive evidence that all such Utopias are unattainable by man? Why, the very fact that men continue to dream such dreams—which, in a measure greater or smaller, is done daily by millions though rarely expressed for fear, no doubt, in most instances, of being called impracticable or Utopian—is to the writer the strongest evidence that something similar

to what I have attempted to depict lies at the heart of mankind, and that it is attainable, and will yet be attained.

Our present system of society was not constructed in a day, nor can it be reconstructed in that period. The wheels of progress, as of truth, revolve slowly but surely; and what men desire and long for most, if not absolutely impracticable, is sure to follow in the process of time. Do you say, then, that what has been portrayed in this work is absolutely impracticable? Have a care, for the predictions of what was thought impracticable, and impossible for man to accomplish, have been too often falsified for man now to dogmatize too strongly upon this theme.

I must now close my picture of life in the New Republic, thoroughly cognizant of the fact that it has been very incompletely and imperfectly drawn; and yet I would indulge the hope that my version of a happier and nobler life for man upon the earth has become sufficiently illustrated and impressed upon the mind of the reader to bear at least a little good fruit. Nothing, however, would give the writer more pleasure than that one possessing a more vivid imagination, with the power to describe more elegantly and delineate more minutely, should take up the subject of life in the New Republic where the present writer has left it, and give to the world a production that would be read and reread in every town, hamlet, and dwelling in the land. The material for such a work is ample, the field for its reception broad. Who will undertake it?

But the reader may here ask, if the time since he was last referred to has not been so long that he has

been forgotten, "Where is the companion who accompanied you at the commencement of your vision—the white-haired, kindly-faced old man whom we had begun to regard with reverence and love?"

Why, my dear reader, he has been with me constantly; not only during the hours of my vision, but also while penning every chapter in this book. Without his presence and the aid of his magic glasses, little indeed could the writer have given you of the external appearance or of the happy and noble life which was led by the people of the New Republic. And while I dwell upon the earth my fervent prayer is that he may still remain by my side, and that his glasses may be at my disposal; for nothing affords me such exquisite joy as to peer into the distant future through their aid and behold the earth transformed into a garden of beauty, and peopled by a race of beings whom it is a joy to look upon. Would you know, reader, the name of my companion—this white-haired, solemn, but sweet-visaged old man? I will give it you as it came from his own lips. At the close of my tenth night's vision he turned, and, looking me smilingly in the face, uttered these words: "Though I shall ever be with you, as I am ever with all mankind, you will not be permitted to behold me again in my present form. It may be pleasing, however, hereafter, for you to know with whom you have spent the past ten nights, in which you have beheld so much, been so much interested and so happy. I am called—TIME!"

At the close of this speech, I awoke; and thus ended my vision.

CHAPTER XIII.

LIFE IN THE EXISTING REPUBLIC.

THE benefits to be derived from the new order of society, foreshadowed in the last chapter and throughout this work, can be shown in no other way, perhaps, more effectually than by contrasting the same with society in its present state; and though life in the existing republic has already been spoken of to no inconsiderable extent, I now propose devoting a chapter to this subject in order to present it to the reader in a somewhat different light, and to touch upon matters heretofore unmentioned.

It is not pretended that there is or can be nothing good in the world under the existing order of society. Believing that there is naturally much more good than evil in mankind, it would be hard for the writer to conceive of any system or systems, however deleterious, for the guidance of society, through which individual goodness and nobleness would not crop out and make itself felt and appreciated. And we find that individual goodness has not been wholly overpowered and exterminated, greatly as the pernicious influences that have been brought to bear upon society have tended to produce such a result. But it is no less than a perfect state of society which the writer takes for his ideal; and, in so far as our present state of society falls short of this, so far should it be re-

garded as in a rudimentary and imperfect condition. Believing it within the province of mankind to rise to a perfect state of existence upon the earth, and that nothing short of this should satisfy their endeavors, while at the same time fully realizing how infinitely remote from this grand ideal is the present status of man, it has seemed to the writer that the interests of the race would be much better served by pointing out the defects of existing customs and established systems, and the evil results arising from them, than by stopping to indulge in self-glorification over present achievements, however great. No one, I think, realizes more fully than the writer the prodigious rise which man has made, say from a being but a shade above the higher brute, to his present comparatively exalted condition; yet for all this we are only part of the way up the ladder, and what is most important is that we cast aside the obstacles which stand in the way of our further ascent, rather than rest content to pause upon the middle rounds and congratulate ourselves upon the height we have attained. Indeed, when the period of man's existence upon the earth, and the wretched condition in which such a vast multitude of human beings may still be found, are taken into consideration, little enough is left, after all, to justify us in any very extended self-glorification. If the rise has been great, the time in which it has been accomplished has also been great; but what should be more particularly noted is that the benefits which have been derived from man's progress have not been shared in, or at least to but a very limited extent indeed, by a vast portion of the race, the condition of these

being at this day but a trifle above that of mankind in barbarous times.

While emphasizing the fact, then, that there is still a vast amount of individual goodness and nobleness among mankind, notwithstanding pernicious systems the natural effect of which has been to crush out so much that was noble, the writer will still continue, as heretofore, pointing out to the best of his ability the defects of our established systems, and their deleterious effects upon the race.

In analyzing existing society in our republic I shall treat of it as I find it; that is, divided into Castes. I know it is claimed that we have no such thing as caste in our country, but if any intelligent human being can take a general view of our present order of society without discovering caste as plainly defined as in any of the countries of the Old World, then his perceptive faculties must be extremely dull. I claim that we have, to-day, in our own country, three as distinct classes, socially, as are or ever were to be found in any country upon the face of the globe, not excepting ancient India, where the order of caste first received its name. These classes, or castes, *originated in the system of private property*, and may be defined as the rich, the middle, and the poorer classes.

Socially, there is no questioning the fact that we have these three castes. Politically, and before the law, it is claimed that all stand equal, but this, again, I as emphatically deny. This falsity, however, having been conclusively shown in Chapter VI., it is unnecessary to follow it further here.

These castes exist, not only in the Republic of the United States, but in every other country upon the

globe where civilization prevails. It will be granted that they exist in a somewhat modified form compared with those of India, and perhaps in no country is this more favorably shown than in our own; yet that these castes remain, and must remain so long as the system of private property continues, is, in the very nature of things, unquestionable. The main difference, in this regard, between our Republic and India, lies in the fact that the division is less arbitrary; a liberty somewhat nearer equal being extended to the different classes, and the privilege being also allowed for rising from one grade or class to another, even from the lowest to the highest. While these privileges are granted, however, the individual is still subject to the influences and advantages peculiar to the class in which his status for the time being is fixed. And the worst of it is that money is the factor by which this status is determined.

As a rule, if the individual is poor, he must content himself with the limited advantages afforded him by poverty. He may be upright morally, or a Shakspere intellectually, but notwithstanding this, he will find it extremely difficult to surround himself by those advantages which he is so eminently fitted by nature and cultivation to enjoy, and of which to be deprived so often dooms him to a life of unhappiness, perhaps of wretchedness. Unless he has in some manner distinguished himself, do you often hear of one of the middle or poorer classes being invited to the banquets or any of the social entertainments of the aristocratic class? You might as well look for honesty in a politician as to look for worth unaccompanied by wealth or distinction in these social

gatherings of the rich. It makes no difference how intelligent, cultured, upright, or worthy an individual may be, he must scale this social wall through distinction or by purchasing his admittance (the usual mode) in order to find a seat within the inner temple of American aristocratic society, or Caste Number One. But with money sufficient to pay his entrance fee, it matters little what else he may lack. He may be as ignorant as a Hottentot, as stupid as an ass, as coarse and vulgar as a fish-wife, as dissolute as a courtesan or cut-throat, and yet his money places him upon a level with the most honored in the land, gathers these about his festive board, and stamps him with the seal of American nobility.

We have many instances, it is true, of individuals rising from one grade to another, and cases also in which they rise from the lowest social scale to the highest rank; still the fact remains that, although the individual may rise or fall from one grade to another, he still finds himself restricted to the influences of his actual surroundings, whatever these may be, while his position, be it high or low, is defined for him by the arbitrary power of wealth.

Now, let us take up, examine, and define the mode of life of the different classes, respectively. Let us begin with the wealthy class, by whom I mean only such as have capital and income sufficient to provide themselves with all the material wants, comforts, and luxuries of life without stint or hindrance. This is really the all-powerful class; the class which sways the scepter over empires, kingdoms, and republics, and to which all others must bow. Let us step, then, into the homes of this opulent

class—or, rather, their palaces, for homes they seldom have; follow them in the daily routine of their lives, unearth the skeleton, and try to ascertain, so far as we may have the knowledge for judging, whether it is probable that their lives are as peaceful and blissful as their sway is powerful.

First let me say that it is what I have reason to regard as the *usual* life which I shall present as the *typical* one, in speaking of this class and the others named, as all are of course aware that the lives of individuals in no two classes correspond in many particulars. Among the rich there are some whose money is so strictly their god that they decline to surround themselves with the luxuries, or even with the comforts, of life, living often in a more frugal manner than some who toil daily to supply their wants. Another class of the rich live comfortably, but still plainly and economically; with no more of the elegances or luxuries than many belonging to the middle class. It is not of these exceptions, however, that I propose to speak here, for it is well known that elegance and luxury are characteristic of the lives of those possessing great wealth; and it is those who live thus, denying themselves little that money can buy to insure the gratification of their desires, whom the writer considers the fair representatives of great wealth; and it is to the lives of such that he now calls attention.

Reader, step now with me into the mansion of one of these representative men of wealth, either in the city or country, and behold the elegance of his surroundings. Proudly he walks the halls of a palace, the capital sunk in the erection of which would

bring sufficient, if put at four per cent. interest, to furnish a score of families equal to his own a far more comfortable support than many are able to obtain from the hardest toil. Yet the cost of the palace in which to dwell is but a minor portion of the total expenditure made by this lord of wealth for the purpose of gratifying the pride, or with the hope of promoting the happiness, of himself and family. To furnish and decorate this mansion in keeping with its general bearing, every portion, perhaps, of the habited globe has been called upon to contribute its choicest specimens of art, the palaces of royalty itself hardly excelling its magnificent inner adornments. To this, as a further outfit for gentility, must be added a superb equipage of horses, carriages, grooms, and liveried flunkeys, besides a host of servants to do the menial labor and attend to the minutest wants of this lord and his household. Add to these, again, munificent entertainments, dinner parties, balls, boxes at the opera and the theater, together with the splendor of dress and costly gems for the decoration of the person, and a multitude of etceteras too numerous to mention, and we begin to gather some faint idea of the enormous amounts which one of these typical lords of wealth lavishes upon himself and family. It may be safely asserted that one such family expend more in their living than hundreds of families of the laboring poor of equal numbers. Granting that the poor families are obliged to curtail so far that their expenditures may not be a fair criterion upon which to base a comparison, yet, with such an immense difference, it becomes plainly evident that the waste is enormous in every such family of the rich.

I know that we often hear it remarked that this waste among the rich is a great blessing to the middle and poorer classes, augmenting trade, furnishing employment, etc. This argument is too absurd to require more than a moment's thought for its complete overthrow. Labor expended in the erection of elegant and costly mansions, or in the manufacture of expensive furniture or works of art to furnish and adorn them; in the production of extravagant equipages or dress, in the procuring of rare gems with which to decorate the person; in superfluous service, or what is in any manner devoted to the product or support of superfluities, is, so far as the material prosperity of mankind is concerned, to a very great extent virtually squandered. All superfluities as well as the necessities of life, cost time and labor, and whatever time and labor are spent in producing luxuries are drawn from the production of the necessities and comforts of life, thereby diminishing the quantity of the latter, necessarily enhancing their value and making them more unattainable to those whose means are limited. Suppose that time and labor were withdrawn from the producing of the superfluities which are now so largely monopolized by the wealthy and a portion of the middle class, and devoted strictly to the producing of the necessities and comforts of life; how long would it be, think you, before we should have the latter in such abundance—unless hoarded or destroyed by the rich—as to effectually drive want from the land? Benefits can never accrue to the laboring class from the lavish waste by the wealthy of that which costs time and labor to produce. Do not let me be understood as opposing

the production of all that may be fitly termed the luxuries of life. I am as much in favor of these, I think, as most men; in fact, I would delight in seeing them produced in quantities far beyond what they have ever yet been, so that every habitation on earth might be adorned and made more attractive. What I strenuously contend for is that each shall contribute his share in this production; and, moreover, that all shall share equally in the blessings to be derived therefrom. But before the luxuries should come the necessities and comforts, and until these can be shared plentifully by every mother's son and daughter that walks the broad earth, the production and squandering of superfluities is a great moral wrong.

Now what say my readers to the situation of our typical lord of wealth and his household? Most will say, probably, they are, or should be, as happy as it is possible for mankind to be upon the earth. Freed as the wealthy are from that harrowing anxiety and toil with which the masses of mankind are beset from the necessity of maintaining a livelihood, yet with every physical want gratified, in a comparison of situations there are some grounds, no doubt, for arriving at such a conclusion. But the question arises: Are there not obstacles to happiness consequent upon the very position occupied by our typical man of wealth and his household, which offset to a very great extent the advantages offered by his wealth? Let us see.

We will take, first, the rich man himself, and afterward the members of his household. Should he have been the gatherer of his own fortune, the habits which he has formed during the process of its accu-

mulation it is more than probable have become so fixed in his nature that he is not likely to stop when he has amassed a competency; but, with that same anxiety and restlessness that has characterized him from the beginning, he continues on endeavoring to add to his already abundant treasures. The greater his possessions, the stronger his desire to preserve and increase them; consequently the greater his anxiety and care, and often the more ceaseless his toil. He cherishes a pride, perhaps, to be distinguished as among the wealthiest, if not *the* wealthiest man in the country, and then no poverty-stricken father with a dozen children depending upon his daily toil for support was ever chained tighter to his post than this slave for wealth. Well, his industry, at all events, I hear you say, is commendable. But is it? Were he a producer, it might be so; but he is simply a gatherer of others' products, raking them together and carrying them off in an elastic bag that will always hold more. Again, in his effort to increase his possessions, he may become imprudent and venturesome, and, from some unlooked for turn, his vast accumulations may stand in jeopardy; ruin, in fact, may stare him in the face. In this position, surely, his peace of mind and happiness are not to be envied. But suppose the rich man takes a different turn, and whether he has acquired his wealth through his own exertions, or has inherited it, he contents himself with endeavoring to enjoy his riches without making effort to increase them, or even to preserve what he has.

It must be granted that such a situation offers to him many advantages for benefiting both himself and his

race. He has the opportunity for culture afforded him; science, literature, the fine arts, and other callings which require money and time to fit for and prosecute with success, presenting an ample field in which he might make his life useful and joyful. But how often do we see him embrace these advantages, or at least embrace them with any vigor? There are a thousand ways in which the leisure hours of the man of wealth might be devoted to improving the condition of himself and his race, but how seldom does he resort to any of them. There is one hobby, however, he often has, and that is to rule—to rule, too, in the interest of himself and his class. When he can buy his way to the legislative hall, and there cast his influence and his vote in favor of laws through which the money that represents the products of labor is poured by a steady stream into the ample pockets of himself, or by which power and privilege are clenched with a little firmer grasp in the hands of his own class—then our man of wealth seems to have reached the height of his ambition.

But without political aspirations, or the desire to still further increase his possessions, how objectless is usually the life of the man who commands great wealth! If he has a taste for travel and for observing life and matters of interest in foreign countries, this may satisfy him for a time; but if he has not this taste, or when this palls on him, as it is likely to soon, he then usually sinks into a round of folly and debauchery in what is termed fashionable life, or becomes a stupid, inanimate drone in a world where action and an object are almost as indispensable to happiness as bread is to life.

In the one case he is as useless in the world as in the other; but, regarding the two cases in the light of their injurious effects, I would say that it were far better for all of them to become drones. Hardly anything that may be conceived of is more pernicious or demoralizing to society than the influence exerted by these *fashionable* autocrats of wealth. The glitter marking the externality of their lives is sufficient to turn the heads of the majority of the race. The dignitaries of the land—presidents, cabinet officers, senators, representatives, judges, and noted lawyers; the highest officers of army and navy, noted literati, distinguished artists, and eminent divines, all sit at their banquets, applaud their stale jokes, and praise their wines, thus lending their influence to dignify and exalt this ignoble and wretched method of life, with all its lavish wastefulness of that which has cost so much to produce, while yet the producers struggle on unnoticed and almost uncared for in poverty and want. A portion of our great middle class strain every nerve, toil incessantly, and not infrequently overstep the bounds of probity, to gain recognition in this much-coveted society, while those so far below as to be without hope often have their hearts embittered and corrupted by pondering over these inequalities of life, and, becoming reckless, commit the darkest of crimes. So much for the influence which the lives of these lords of wealth exert upon society; and so, I say, far better were it that they should die of *ennui*, be buried and forgotten, than that they should pursue this course of fashionable life which so beguiles and corrupts humanity.

But if the lives of so many of the heads of families

among the rich are objectless and spent in idleness, how much more do we find this to be the case with the members of their household! Observation and experience have demonstrated the fact beyond question that hardly any greater curse can befall children than to be reared in affluence and with the knowledge that their father is so rich that no effort on their part is required. The boy, particularly, is handicapped at the start in his race of life when he has once become conscious of this fact, and to keep it from him is impossible. He may, possibly, be kept at school and the university throughout a full scholastic term, but in nine cases out of ten that fatal knowledge of vast possessions has sapped his energies and left him without thrift, like the stunted oak or pine we see growing from out the sand. He has plenty of money to spend, and thinks more of having a good time, of hazing his school-fellows or being out upon a frolic, than he does of his books. He may receive his graduating diploma, but this is more likely to be a matter of favor on account of his wealthy and influential parents than of just desert. Upon leaving college he drives fast horses, drinks rum, seeks the society of fast women, and, perhaps, takes up some profession, as nothing short of this would comport with the dignity of his station. But what does he amount to in this? Usually nothing, absolutely nothing. The truth is, that so far as the usefulness of his life is concerned, it was completely paralyzed in his youth, rendered objectless, motiveless, when he learned the deplorable fact that there was no necessity for him to exert himself in order to obtain a livelihood.

Mere ciphers in the world, so far as usefulness goes, are these rich men's sons, as a rule, and they are about as much to be pitied as the sons of the abject poor. How many a promising youth has gone down to an untimely grave through intemperance and debauchery, merely from the lack of an object in the world—something for which he might strive and toil. Never shall I forget the language, or the sorrowful, painful expression with which it was uttered, of a young man I met in Europe some dozen years ago. He was the son of a wealthy man in one of the cities of our country, and was then traveling upon the continent for the benefit of his health. His constitution was badly shattered, appearances indicating that he had but a short time to stay upon earth, though he was but twenty-five years of age.

In conversations which I had had with him upon former occasions he had told me that he had brought his infirmities upon himself through an imprudent, reckless course of living; but, at the time of the particular outburst of feeling which I am about to relate, his whole past life seemed to rise up in a moment before him with such vividness and force as to completely overwhelm and almost frenzy him.

Conversing with him in his room as he was slowly rallying from an acute attack of his disease, he broke forth vehemently in language substantially as follows: "Mr. ——, I feel that I have but a short time to stay here, and it will be said, no doubt, that I have been my own executioner. It is true that the immediate cause of my troubles has been my excessive indulgences, but the *real cause* lies back of this—it is *that my father is rich.* I had the best of

constitutions, was more rugged and hearty than most of my schoolmates at college, but, fortunately for most of these, their fathers were not rich like mine, and they were obliged to put forth efforts for their own support. I had no object in life, nothing to strive for.

"Many of my college mates I saw, just before leaving home, engaged in some useful employment, in good health, contented and happy. A similar condition would, no doubt, be my own to-day but for the fact that the wealth of my father was so great as to paralyze all my efforts to engage in any occupation; hence I became idle, intemperate, and dissolute. My parents being the kindest, and longing for nothing so much as my happiness, indulged my every desire, and the result has been what you now see. Oh, my dear parents, how painfully have their hopes miscarried!

"They sought and toiled for wealth, that they might make my life happy. They struggle on now between hope and fear over my present condition; their letters bespeak the anxiety of their hearts, and yet I feel that I must go, and what a blow it will be to them!

"Had my parents remained poor as they once were, and brought me up to some useful occupation, all this would no doubt have been changed. I firmly believe that the greatest curse that can befall a child is that he should be reared in affluence so great as to stifle all ambition to win for himself a place and a name in the world."

I have repeated the young man's language, as nearly as I can recollect, as he gave it me. Losing

the impressiveness of his manner of utterance, his words must, of course, lose much of their force upon the mind of the reader, and yet it is to be hoped that these few sentences, which were almost his last, have not been reproduced wholly in vain.

But, I would ask, in searching for the cause of his troubles and sufferings, did the young man strike bottom—hit upon the root of the evil after all? It seems to me not. Had he dug a little deeper he would have struck upon the system of *private property*, which caused his father to scheme for the riches that killed his boy. And how many incidents similar to the one related above are almost daily taking place!

Truly, the fond parents who heap up great treasures of gold little realize that they are digging a pitfall into which their children are almost sure to stumble, rather than rearing for them a pedestal upon which they may stand, as it is so fondly hoped, to acquire happiness and renown.

Now we come to the daughters of the rich; and is their situation less unfortunate than that of the sons? With nothing to toil for, nothing to strive for, except to market themselves to those in their own station of life, and this with little consideration whether that love which alone constitutes true marriage has any part in the case, they grow up without doing a stroke of useful labor, and about as useless, so far as their efforts may contribute to the welfare of the race, as the marble statues that decorate the halls of their fathers' palaces.

Analyze their status, now, and see what they are physically and mentally. Physically, usually weak,

puny, dyspeptic, and hypochondriac; a mere bundle of nerves, almost without blood, muscle, or vitality. Jaded by a constant round of excitement and dissipation, at the very threshold of life we usually find them broken down, faded, and whitewashed. Fit subjects they are, indeed, for maternity, or for performing the duties of life in any capacity!

Mentally these daughters of the rich have usually acquired a polish which befits their frivolous surroundings; but of such matters as can alone render their lives of any particular value to their race they evince the most signal ignorance. Feeding upon an intellectual diet of romance and folly, they bring forth its concomitant fruits. Thus, without health or vigor of either body or mind, their lives must necessarily become as insipid, unsatisfactory, and miserable to themselves as they are useless to their fellow-beings.

Nor are the lives of the matrons of these wealthy families fraught with more peace of mind to themselves or usefulness to society than are those of the children, or of the rich lord himself. Their chief desire usually appears to be to maintain the dignity of the household and to see that their sons and daughters contract alliances befitting their station. But to maintain this dignity the anxieties of the wealthy matron are usually sufficient to keep her living in a constant state of turmoil. Woman has naturally an overpowering sense of the necessity for maintaining the dignity of position, and when matters that concern this do not run smoothly life has little charm for her.

But sons and daughters reared under such auspices as are those of the rich are usually not the

most tractable of beings, and between matrimonial inclinations and matrimonial alliances which do not meet her approval, and the host of other things that disturb her pride, the life of the wealthy matron is usually anything but rose-colored, and hardly such as her poorer sisters need covet.

Indulge not the thought, reader, that life is all sunshine in the hearts of those who have nothing to occupy them that is useful, whose thoughts are mostly occupied by frivolities, even though they may be surrounded by all the grandeur imaginable and are the recipients of many honors conferred on them because of their riches. If you have formed such an opinion, then you greatly mistake human nature.

This continuous whirl of high life soon becomes distasteful and irksome to most, to many even disgusting, and to all exceedingly wearing and life-destroying; but, once launched, they are borne on by the current into unforeseen seas of folly, from which they are rarely extricated, except, when, fortunately for themselves, they become financially wrecked. To turn aside would be to lose influence and caste, and, therefore, too mortifying to the pride to be for a moment entertained by the average human being.

It is a life of infatuation and excitement, of strife to excel and eclipse, and, therefore, a life of intrigue, envy, hatred, malice, rather than one of contentment, happiness, peace. And is it, let me ask, within the possibilities of human nature for mankind to enjoy their lives to any considerable extent, producing nothing of benefit either to themselves or their kind; mere drones in the hive, consuming and wasting what others have produced? Why, it seems to me that

the inertia and uselessness of such a life, were there no worse evils arising from it, would be sufficient to render it unbearable.

"But," say some, "if the lives of these autocrats of wealth are really as miserable and as unsatisfactory to themselves as you represent, we can hardly admit that this class is as *useless* to society as you seem to regard them. Is it not their capital, largely, that furnishes the means for the prosecution of most of those enterprises, great and small, that are pursued in civilized communities, and through which the wants of humanity are supplied; and, besides, are they not also the frequent and bountiful dispensers of charity?"

To both of these questions I answer decidedly, No. Under our existing property system it is true that much of the capital employed in these enterprises is claimed by a comparatively few wealthy possessors as *their own*, and it is so regarded by the public; but, as a rule, this capital having been filched from those who produced it, it cannot in any manner of justice and right be called *theirs*. Hence they may not rightfully be regarded as the benefactors of mankind through any use which they may make of their possessions. The justice of the system of private property must be granted before much that is now called charity can be properly regarded as such.

Others may dignify dispensations of the products of labor by those who have not themselves been the real producers with the high-sounding name of charity, but to me this appears nothing more than a partial restitution by the non-producers to the real producers, of the products of the latter's toil, of which they should never have been deprived.

But, as the system of private property exists, and under it so-called charity must be dispensed or greater suffering ensue, then let us speak of this matter of dispensing charity as we behold it under the present condition of things. Charity, then, under the system of private property must be measured by the means of the dispenser. The widow's mite, as set forth in the New Testament, is a most beautiful illustration of this. In estimating the charities of the rich, then, whether they be bountiful, moderate, or niggardly, the criterion must be the *means of the giver.*

Now, grounding the matter upon this basis, who does not know that, as a rule, the charities dispensed by the rich are niggardly in the extreme? Ask the poverty-stricken and distressed, and they will tell you that the greater portion of the relief which is extended to them in their sufferings comes from those in a condition but a trifle above their own. It is an undeniable fact that the poor assist one another bountifully in proportion to their means. Their gifts may be small, but they are constant; and were it not for this mutual assistance among them, their sufferings would be terrible indeed, and the list of deaths by starvation and other miseries would be awful to contemplate. It is true that we read or hear sometimes of gifts or bequests made by some individual of wealth for some public purpose that, if measured by the sum and not by the means of the giver, might appear a large amount; but to what purpose are these sums of money usually devoted? Are they to relieve the sufferings or ameliorate the condition of those who have been the principal producers of this wealth, or are they usually for some

other purpose? Are not a vast portion of these gifts or bequests sunk in the founding and maintenance of some theological institution, or in building some magnificent church edifice—spasmodic attempts, I may say, to appease an angry God and cheat the devil of his due? It may be held that such institutions are of much benefit to society; if so, I emphatically dissent; but my views upon this subject have been already expressed. Occasionally, yet very rarely, gifts or bequests are made by the rich for the purpose of secular education and other like benefits to the community, and for all such let them be awarded due praise. Now and then there arises a Bigelow or a Cooper, and if only such large-hearted philanthropists were less rare, the system of private property would not work such wretched results as we may now behold from it; but such benefactors can appear only as exceptions to the general rule, the system itself forbidding this through its natural corruption of the souls of men. And when these wealthy autocrats do give, they take good care to do it in such a manner that it will be heralded all over the land. They sometimes feign to hide, modestly, but somehow the names of donors always come out, and come, too, with a flourish of trumpets that resound throughout the land. The great modesty of the giver in not wishing his name to be known is, of course, dilated upon, leading one to suppose, from reading the public journals, that an angel has descended and is dwelling with us upon the earth.

A Vanderbilt pays a portion of the expense of moving an obelisk from Egypt, and there is no end to his laudation. Yet what a pittance the gift, when

it is considered that the income of this individual is $10,000,000 or so annually.

Well, it is better, no doubt, that this class should be highly lauded for all their gifts; otherwise they would soon become wholly like the sponge, absorbing but never giving back except they are squeezed. I cannot admit that this opulent class is necessary or useful to society in any sense. There are a few noble exceptions, without doubt, but in general I am constrained to regard the lives of this wealthy class as unsatisfactory to themselves and useless, demoralizing, and destructive to their kind—demoralizing in their influence, as those below are constantly struggling to attain a like position at the sacrifice of health, probity, and peace of mind; and destructive in that they consume and waste whilst they do not produce.

Now let us turn our attention to that great middle class which in our country, as in all civilized countries, take so prominent a part in all that is most beneficial to the race. To speak of this class minutely, it would be necessary to divide it into at least three other classes—first, those who in point of wealth are but a shade below the opulent class and are straining every nerve to be admitted into its circle; next, those who occupy a position somewhat of independence, financially, but whose resources will not admit of prodigality; and the lower grade are those who, though possessing some small means, are so dependent upon circumstances that sickness, misfortune, or what is termed ill-luck, would shortly reduce them to the condition of the abject poor. The average of this class being represented by the middle grade, as

given above, it is this grade which will be regarded in what follows as representing the middle class.

The influence exerted by the opulent class upon the middle has already been alluded to, but this influence is so tremendous that we can form but little estimate of its magnitude without tracing it through the various channels in which it makes itself manifest. I can note only some of the most important of these.

To keep up appearances, or to pass for all one is worth, as it is sometimes laconically expressed, is a prevailing custom among our middle class, and, in fact, the greater portion of them do indeed pass for a great deal more than they are worth. In other words, their expenditures are oftentimes far in excess of what is warranted by their incomes. This manifests itself in the erection of dwellings more expensive than they can afford, or the leasing of such at rentals which they are not warranted in paying; in the furnishing of the same beyond their means, in the giving of expensive entertainments, in carriage equipments or hire, and above all, perhaps, in elegant adornment of the person. Now what is the real cause of all this imprudence, extravagance, and general recklessness in the mode of living of our great middle class, the deplorable effects of which, so painfully apparent, are continually being voiced by preachers and moralists, expressed in groans and tears by those who have suffered from their direful consequences, and, in spite of all these warnings, continue to multiply and increase, filling the world with sorrows and miseries the half of which may not be told? I answer that it is the spirit of emulation, the desire to

present appearances allied to those of the opulent class. Those who have been successful in gathering in superabundance the bounties of earth make of these a glittering display in multitudinous forms, and the attempt to imitate their example by those who have not the adequate means brings imprudence, extravagance, recklessness, overwork, anxiety, sorrow, dishonesty, crime, suicide, disease, death, and a numberless host of other evils. And yet, it cannot be counted blameworthy in any human being that he should seek to rank socially upon an equality with his fellow-men.

It is humiliating to every human being to be regarded as little better than a dog whose place it is to slink away into a corner in presence of his fellow-creatures; and yet our unnatural and wretched system of society virtually compels this of much the larger share of the race, thus stripping human beings of their manliness, their self-respect, and reducing them to the rank of mere puppets. Is it reprehensible in men that they should endeavor to avoid this? and, while under our existing society it is money as a rule that gives position, is it at all to be wondered at that they should commit excesses — that they should often overreach the bounds of rectitude for the purpose of accomplishing their desires?

The temptations which beset mankind under such circumstances have already been pointed out sufficiently in the chapter upon morals, and it is unnecessary to follow the matter further here, except to bring out a point that was omitted there, namely, that man's deviations from the path of strict rectitude are probably more often than otherwise prompted

by a desire that is as noble and as holy as any that finds place in the human soul.

What causes the father, think you, to build a house better than he can afford, to furnish it beyond his means, to purchase expensive apparel for his wife and daughter, or in any manner to spend beyond what is warranted by his income? It may be, it is true, from an inmate love of display within himself, but I will venture to assert that in nine cases out of ten he is drawn into this extravagance from the affection, the deep love in his heart, for wife and children. He himself cares little for these things, perhaps, but he desires to see his family mingling in good society, and it pains him to see them more poorly dressed, or having things in general of a meaner order, than those with whom they associate; and so, often out of the kindest and noblest impulses of the heart, he allows himself to be carried on beyond the bounds of prudence, and finally of rectitude, into crime and ruin. Ah, how many a noble soul has tripped and fallen in striving to place those who were so dear to him in a position of equality with those whom nature has designed for equals, but against which a false system of society has barred its gates! "Hell," they say, "is paved with good intentions." Place, then, the system of private property as Satan at the entrance of the infernal pit, luring man on with his guile, and with a strong hand hurling him over the brink, and you have the picture complete.

I shall be accused here again, no doubt, of attempting to frame a plausible excuse for vice, but I am doing nothing of the kind. I am merely demon-

strating how evils spring naturally and spontaneously out of the existing system of private property.

But there is one blessing that is enjoyed by the great middle as well as the poorer class, that is virtually denied to the rich. They have an object to strive for, to toil for; and that object is to provide the daily necessities of life. This must be counted a blessing when compared with the objectless life of those of the opulent class; and yet rather an equivocal blessing withal, for so incessant does their toil necessarily become to provide for the necessities of life, and, more than all, to keep up appearances, that the man is likely to be turned into a mere machine for grinding out bread.

Let us glance now for a moment at the daily routine of those who compose the great middle class, that we may see in what a tread-mill their lives are cast. If dwelling in the city or village, the father of the family, after taking an early morning meal, proceeds directly to his place of business, and there applies himself incessantly for ten, perhaps for twelve or fourteen, hours, usually to duties that are of the most harassing and wearing character, with an intermission of but ten minutes to a half hour for lunch. At night he returns to his home, weary, careworn and jaded from the day's exertions, more than likely anxious and disturbed in mind over the many annoyances and difficulties with which he has had to contend during the day, and perhaps confronted with more serious difficulties consequent upon the ruinous competition which he is obliged to meet, which has already sounded in his ears the alarm of failure and ruin. While yet young, full of vigor, and not over-

burdened with a family, he may have the faculty of dismissing for a time these harassing anxieties; takes his wife out, perhaps, for an evening call upon friends; attends some place of amusement, or manages in some other manner to relieve his mind in part of its burdens, but as age increases and these diversions begin to pall upon him, he is more likely, after looking over the evening paper, to throw himself upon the sofa and there brood over his difficulties and devise plans through which he hopes they may be removed. And so in this distracting round his life, if life it may be called, moves on from day to day. Little time for quiet repose, little time to enjoy nature, little time to recruit the body, little time to cultivate the mind, little time or inclination to enjoy the society of his fellows, but wholly engrossed in providing for the wants of himself and those most dear to him.

This, or something very similar to this, is, in brief, the fate of the honest man of the middle class who is a dweller in the city or village, while the dishonest man's fate is still more wretched.

How different, then, from that of the machine in its monotonous round is the life of the typical honest man of the middle class? The difference, I take it, is mostly in favor of the machine, which stops for repairs, and does not usually run nights, while the brain of the man, if not the body, often toils on incessantly awake or asleep.

And the life of the matron of this class is no less slavish than that of her husband. Her duties are hardly less incessant, onerous, or wearisome. Straitened in the finances allowed her for expenditure, she

that families should be thinly scattered over the face of the earth, dwelling as remotely as possible; but if, on the other hand, intelligence and education are preferable to ignorance; and if refinement, self-confidence, acuteness, and activity of mind, are qualities deserving of cultivation, then it would seem that a system of living whereby mankind may be brought into habitual social contact would be a system far preferable to the existing one. It is evident, too, that those most intelligent, ambitious, and aspiring, whose lot has been cast amid the monotony and stupor of these isolated homes, are not insensible to their hardships and disadvantages. We often wonder at the proneness of our farmers' sons to quit the home of their birth, with all its endearing ties of kinship, and flee away to the villages and great cities. They are often censured for this, and the cause is generally attributed to pride or laziness, or a disposition to find some employment considered more genteel or requiring less arduous manual labor. Parents, even, are sometimes prompted to accuse their sons of ingratitude and a want of filial affection for leaving them thus as they are becoming advanced in years.

It is, no doubt, one of the severest trials which parents in the rural districts are called upon to endure, that, after having reared their children to that adult age when they have become competent for relieving to a great extent their hardships, and just at the time when they are beginning to feel that their burdens may now be lightened, in part, at least, by those who will feel a natural pride in protecting their interests, they find that the hearts of their children

have gone out into the wide world; that a desire which cannot be overcome has taken possession of them to quit the parental roof and take up their abode in some village or great city. At first, it is the eldest son, perhaps, and then another, and so on until sons and daughters have all gone, and the home is broken up, the aged parents sacrificing the old hearth at last to follow their children into new homes where all may be done that affection can do for them; but yet there will always be something lacking, something to which these aged hearts will instinctively and deploringly turn. Cruel, indeed, are these separations from the paternal home, and still more cruel the necessity that aged parents should be left childless, or that they must bid adieu to the spot more precious than any other can ever be to them again; and yet it is one of the inevitable effects of this system of isolated homes, and one for which I can see no other cure than adopting the community home that has been portrayed in this work.

Now, what causes these children of the rural districts to forsake the paternal hearth and flock in droves to the towns and great cities, continually filling these centers to overflowing? They leave, probably, situations in which they are certain to obtain a livelihood, such as it is, for positions of uncertainty, or more often for no situation at all, trusting in head and hands and an indomitable will to procure some employment whereby they may win their way to something better than that which they have left. They may be thrust back again, eventually, upon something no better than they have left; and many

will be; but, notwithstanding, they are going to make a struggle to win at something else.

There must be something of no insignificant nature that prompts so many to make this effort, and I think that something it is not difficult to discover. It is not laziness, neither is it pride, nor a lack of filial affection, which induces them to quit the paternal home and venture upon these uncertainties. They are willing to work, to work, too, with a will, in the town or city, and at occupations, also, quite as menial as that which they have left, providing they promise success; and the separation from parents and home have probably been no less severe a struggle to themselves than to those they have left behind. No, they are not heartless, nor are they idle, foppish vagabonds, but they are usually the most active, energetic, and aspiring among the whole circle of the youth who are reared in these isolated homes that make this daring venture. If there is a dolt in the family, he is the one usually who stays at home with the old folks.

Now that which is most potent in influencing our youth to quit their isolated homes for the village or the city is an instinctive and overwhelming desire for a more extended and familiar social intercourse with their kind, together with the attractions and advantages practicable only by the concentration of mankind in numbers.

Think of the youth, the young man or woman, who has any ambition or hope to make much of themselves in the world, being tied down to a sphere of life so contracted as they find themselves in these isolated homes. Far away, perhaps, from any vil-

lage, with neighbors few and far between, they plod on in their dull, monotonous, wearisome round of life to support a mere physical existence. Of books they usually have few, and this for two reasons: the one that they cannot afford them, and the other that, occupied as they are from morning till night in exhaustive labor, they have little inclination for reading or study. And let me say here that it is and will remain a fact, no matter how forcibly or widely may be voiced the value of culture, that whenever mankind are obliged to devote some ten to twelve hours of each day to provide for daily wants, they will remain, as a rule, in comparative ignorance. When the vitality of the body is sapped by long-continued exhausting labor, there is not, there cannot exist, much disposition for the cultivation of the mind. And so here in this tread-mill of toil, almost isolated from their kind, these youth grow up rude, uncouth, awkward, timid, uncultured, and yet with natural faculties that only require development to make them the peers of those who, more highly favored, raise themselves to positions of distinction and honor. What is required for their development is that they should mix more freely with their kind, have the rough edges knocked off, and a polish given to their manners, acquire self-confidence, and, more perhaps than all, have their wits sharpened and a new tone and activity given to their minds by coming in contact with those who are cultivated.

Full rounded development of the mind is as unattainable under this condition of isolated farm life as the science of astronomy would be to him whose time, except for intervals of sleep, was occupied

in laboring in a mine beneath the surface of the earth. And let me tell you that this rude, uncultured farm youth, when he has that within him which is capable of being expanded into true manhood or genius—as is often the case—has an instinctive knowledge of what is required for his development. He is aware of his rudeness, his awkwardness, his timidity, his ignorance; but he knows that it has been circumstances beyond his control that have been the cause; and is he to be blamed if he seeks to escape from his thralldom—to pass out into the wide world where the opportunities are more favorable for his making a man of himself? I say that the inclination to flee from a life so stale, so monotonous, wearisome, and unpromising, with the hope of satisfying his tastes and desires, improving his condition and elevating himself, is not only blameless but highly commendable. I care not how others may sing the praises of isolated farm life, I know from experience that it is little more, nor is there much more to be made out of it, than a mere state of animal existence.

To provide the necessaries of life and give his children the rudiments of an education, the isolated farmer must deny himself most of those pleasures which contribute to the enjoyment of a fully-rounded life, and like a pack-horse must stumble along under his load, without recreation, without amusements, without travel, without information to any comparative extent; with little indeed to lift up his soul above the beast with which he ploughs the field.

Now, by way of contrast, let us turn for a moment

to agricultural life as carried on in the communities of the New Republic, which has been portrayed to the reader in these pages. In this we found no stint of social advantages; much more, in fact, than are at present obtainable in our villages, or, as a rule, in our great cities. Under the same roof with two hundred or so of their kind, the family might enjoy the exclusiveness and the quiet domestic repose of their own apartments, or its members might step in a moment into the drawing-room, on the piazza, or into any of the public rooms of the elegant abode, and mingle freely with the most cultivated and refined of their race. Music, dancing, theatricals, lectures, the debate, games of many varieties; in short, almost every refined social entertainment which the mind of man had been capable of devising had here been brought into requisition for the purpose of amusing, instructing, and making existence enjoyable. In the reading-rooms could be found an abundance of daily and weekly papers, magazines, and reviews; while from the extensive library could be procured all the latest works extant in every department of science and literature. The community provided all these social privileges, equal to and beyond those found now in our great cities, while ample leisure was also afforded all for the enjoyment of them. Under such opportunities and privileges as the community affords, rural life might indeed be made the most charming of any life conceivable. When the two may be combined, communion with nature and a free intercourse with the noblest of our kind, there is no other position in

which the lines of men may be cast that can equal rural life.

But what cares the fagged-out farmer of the present day for the beauties of nature by which he is ever surrounded? As a rule, he is as insensible to them as the ox or ass that draws his cart. Under a just and wise system of industry and property the leisure and opportunity for the cultivation of all the nobler attributes of man's nature may be accorded to all; and with this leisure and opportunity will come the disposition for such cultivation. When this change comes, as come it eventually must, then will rural life become so enjoyable that the sons and daughters of the agricultural districts will have no desire, as now, for flocking to the cities.

Space forbids our pursuing in further detail the life of our great middle class. But if the picture which has been so faintly outlined here is a fair representation of life among this class, then what shall be said of it? It will not be denied that there are many exceptions, many individual instances to which the picture drawn here would not fully or fairly apply, but the question is, have I not given a fair representation of the average type of the lives of the vast majority who go to make up this great class? Can it be denied that the object, in the main, of the vast majority of this class is merely to support a bare physical existence; that they are merely tread-mill drudges whose lives are continually harassed by care, anxiety, turmoil, and trouble?

And yet, unpromising and unenviable as such a life may appear, there is little question that the average life of the middle class is more satisfactory, that

more real comfort and happiness is enjoyed among those who compose it than is enjoyed by either the class above or below.

Such, then, without doubt, being the fact, who, after a careful investigation, will venture to assert that, to the great masses of mankind, life, *as it now exists*, can be counted worth living?

Shall we say, then, that it is the destiny of man that his life must ever continue thus unsatisfactory? No, a thousand times no. It is the inhumanity of man, caused chiefly by the establishment of wretched systems, which makes life, both to the oppressor and the oppressed, to a greater or less degree wretched and unendurable. By a wise and just law of our being, the tyranny and wrong of the oppressor must ever recoil upon his own head, as well as upon the oppressed—a truth which, when once fully understood and realized, must result in the extirpation of all oppression.

But if life, withal, as it exists upon the earth, may be regarded as thus unsatisfactory to the typical human being of the two upper classes, what must be the portion of those who walk in the lowest rank, of whom I shall now attempt to speak? In speaking of the indigent and poverty-stricken class, however, it is not my purpose to go into particulars relative to their existing condition; but rather to endeavor to impress upon the minds of the reader *his own culpability* in the fact that the miseries which this class endure are allowed a place in the world. Volumes might be filled in detailing their distresses and sufferings; their struggles to obtain a bare subsistence; their destitution, want, and woes. All the harrowing

detail of their hardships might be prolonged almost indefinitely. We might stir momentarily afresh the sympathy of the reader by picturing the squalor of their homes, if homes they may be called; by speaking of parents who, with families to support, are struggling constantly throughout the long wearisome day for a mere pittance barely sufficient to keep themselves and their families from starvation, and who, while providing their tables with only the coarsest of food and denying themselves even a sufficiency of this that their children may be afforded a more ample allowance, and practicing the same economy in regard to clothing, still have their hearts agonized by the wants and sufferings of their little ones. We might make the shock more thrilling by picturing families of little children scantily covered with rags and shivering with cold, looking up imploringly into the faces of helpless parents and begging for food when food they have none to give nor any means or prospect of means through which it might be procured. We might harrow the soul still deeper by relating instances not a few where the sufferings of poverty have become unbearable; where woman has been forced to yield her virtue to its hardships; and both men and women alike, suffering until they could endure no longer, have at last put an end to their existence. Such instances in thousands of cases, and others little less horrifying, might be cited; but it would be but reiterating tales that are told us daily and have been told for ages past. It would be but the still further familiarizing of our minds with that which has already become so familiar to us as to lose its impressiveness in a great

measure, and have a tendency, perhaps, to make us regard their miseries as the inevitable destiny of a vast portion of the human race. I shall make no attempt, therefore, to describe the miseries of the poor, but shall leave such recitals to our public journals, where they may always be found. Neither, as I can see, would it be of service to the reader to give here the daily routine of those composing this class; hence I shall not attempt it.

What is most needed, in my opinion, is not so much to repeat to the reader the sufferings of this great class of humanity, as to impress upon the minds and hearts of those in more favorable circumstances the wickedness of suffering such wretchedness to exist. It is because these wrongs have so long been familiar to us that our eyes are blinded and consciences seared to their enormity. The theological theory which has so long been dinned into the ears of mankind, that an all-wise and beneficent Creator has so ordered things that this inequality must forever continue in the world—that these hardships and sufferings must be endured by the many, while the few roll in luxury—is one of the most monstrous and damnable doctrines that was ever promulgated, and has done more to prolong the sufferings of the poor than any other influence, perhaps I may say than all other influences, that can be named. "Submit, suffer, and endure here that your reward may be the greater hereafter," has had the most direct and direful effect of making the lives of millions upon the earth lives of wretchedness and woe. Before one-half the earth's surface had been but barely scratched for cultivation, and the other half not cultivated at

all, the Rev. Malthus quiets the consciences of the affluent in England, and the rest of the world, with the theory that a beneficent Creator has so ordered matters that population tends to increase in a geometrical ratio, while supplies of food can increase only in an arithmetical one; thus endeavoring to relieve the rich of the responsibility of poverty by representing it as beyond their power to control, and heaping, thereby, the responsibility upon the head of a Creator.

Man constructs a god; endows him with attributes similar to his own, making him, however, as much more tyrannical as he is regarded as more powerful than man; appoints himself this god's vicegerent upon the earth; brings his fellow through fear to bow down before him as this god's vicegerent; treads him under his feet, and throws the responsibility for all his iniquities upon the god whom he has had the audacity to invent. When knowledge at last comes, and men get their eyes wide open to the fact of how they and their fathers for long ages have been duped, how they have suffered, groaned, bled and died, from the iniquitous and blasphemous doctrine that it has been ordained by a Creator that poverty shall ever remain upon the earth, there will then come a demand in thunder tones for a change; a demand, too, that will have to be heeded. That justice which is due to all will then be called for, and it will have to be granted.

Were strict justice meted out to all, the laborer might ride in his carriage while he who is now the lordly nabob would be obliged to go on foot. Herein lies a truth which will some day be found adequate

for the upsetting and overturning of the whole fabric of existing society, and establishing in its place a humane system of property that shall accord justice to all. When this great truth becomes fully realized, it will no longer be possible to shift the responsibility for all this poverty, and the wretchedness arising therefrom, off upon a Creator. Every one of us above this pinching poverty will then begin to discover that we ourselves are responsible for it, and will begin to recognize the full enormity of our crime.

H. C. Carey, in his "Social Science," after enumerating many instances of wretchedness in England consequent upon the extreme poverty there, has told us that there is an "atmosphere of gloom perpetually hanging over England; great forebodings and intense anxiety as to the welfare of posterity."

And what is the cause of all these forebodings, all this anxiety, save a secret dread of calamities consequent upon that injustice which the people of the higher classes know in their innermost souls, though they will not confess it, stalks so high-handed throughout the land? And this same gloom hangs over our own land as well as every other land where this system of private property is recognized, and must continue to cast its baleful shadow until the accursed system is extirpated, root and branch.

For myself, I confess that I can rarely walk ten blocks in our city without meeting with some piteous object of humanity that so excites my sympathy as to cut my soul to the very quick; and that the effect of these human miseries which everywhere stare us in the face is to cast a gloom over my spirits which it

is obliged to practice the strictest economy, often denying herself much that she desires and needs for her own comfort, the better to provide for those whom she so much loves. Usually sharing, also, in her husband's anxieties and troubles, her life is, of course, very similar to his, neither of which furnishes much evidence of that peace, contentment, and joy which might and should be shared by all mankind upon the earth to an extent little dreamed of, usually, under existing society.

Then, as to the children. Every effort may have been made to give them the best education the straitened circumstances of the parents would permit; and this, together with the inculcation of good habits, good morals, and the establishment of bodily health, is really the most and best that can be done for them. Where these essentials to virtue and prosperity have been complied with, the probability is that, as a rule, their lives will flow on in a channel similar to that of the parents who have gone before, to be measured by a degree of happiness and peace that, except by comparison, may hardly be considered enviable; while, on the other hand, if they have formed pernicious associations, and fallen into vicious habits, their miseries may become incalculable.

Now let us turn to that great portion of the middle class whose lives are spent in rural homes. In speaking of the opulent class, I made no allusion to their life in the country, as in all essential points to which I am endeavoring to call the attention of the reader, it is much the same to them whether in town or country. In fact, they are seldom to be found

living an isolated country life, except for short seasons during the summer months.

The lives of our great middle class will be found to be in the country, as in the city, not much above that of mere *drudges* whose principal object it is to maintain a mere animal existence. They have, usually, less harassing cares and anxieties in their vocations than those of their class living in the cities and villages, but their manual labor is greater, exhausting their energies in such a measure as to leave little inclination for the cultivation of those higher attributes with which mankind are endowed by nature. In one important respect, however, and one which has a greater bearing than all others in influencing the happiness and shaping the result of their lives, the dwellers in the rural districts are situated at a decided *disadvantage* to those living in the cities and towns. I refer to the privileges and benefits derived by mankind from intimate association with their fellow-beings—the advantages which follow the closest, the most intimate and extended of *social relations*. This subject of existence isolated in a great measure from one's fellow-men, is one which I regard as of such vast importance that I shall confine what few remarks I have to make respecting the rural life of our great middle class principally to this.

So popular at present is our system of individual land proprietorship, allotting to every man a farm, that language can hardly be found adequate for according to this system the praises which it is thought to deserve. Well, if ignorance is bliss, and if boorishness, timidity, and stupidity are to be ranked among the cardinal virtues, then, no doubt, it is well

portion of those who are wage laborers; of those who pursue, independent of the dictation of others, a trade or profession; of those engaged in agriculture, manufacture, or trade; all, in fact, who are not in the possession of an income sufficient to provide in a becoming manner for the wants of themselves or those dependent upon them, suffer at times from poverty. This shows, conclusively, that the principal cause for poverty must be sought in some other channel than in the vices of the poor. That cause has been named a hundred times in this work, but it will bear reiterating a hundred times more. The cause, I again say, is the spoliation of the laborer, the producer, by means of the system of private property; by those who become rich through such spoliation in the shape of rent, interest, and profits.

And here, I would illustrate more particularly than I have done, heretofore, how this spoliation is accomplished through *profits*. H. C. Carey, in his "Social Science," has pointed out many instances where products of great magnitude only yield the producers about one-tenth of what the consumers are obliged to pay for them; ninety per cent. of what is realized sticking to the fingers of the trader, transporter, banker, etc., for exchanges. The English factory operative, he tells us, has to pay upon the average ten times more for the grain he consumes than the Iowa farmer realizes for it; and, again, the Iowa farmer has to pay in turn, in a tenfold ratio, more for the clothing he wears upon his back than the producer receives for it. Then, to illustrate the matter a little nearer home, where transportation cannot affect the matter so much, I would say that

the paper on which I am now writing I paid thirty cents a quire for at a stationery store on Sixth avenue, while I buy paper quite equal of a wholesale house in the city for one dollar and a half a ream, or seven and one-half cents a quire; and this paper, I was told at the house where I purchased it, the manufacturer was paid one dollar a ream for, or five cents a quire. Here we see an increase between the producer and the consumer in a six-fold ratio. It may be safely asserted, without doubt, that the price *upon the average* is, at least, *quadrupled*, between the producer and the consumer; and, when this fact is considered, it is not difficult to discover how it is that the comparatively few who are engaged as go-betweens in the exchange of the commodities of earth become enormously rich, or that the producers are usually poverty-stricken. The manner in which a few grow rich, while many remain poor, is indeed so plain that he who runs may read.

And this, moreover, is but one cause among the many already mentioned from which the laborer suffers under the existing system of private property; and yet the laborer, the producer, anxious, careworn and weary, often poverty-stricken and wretched, has to provide for all this robbery through his toil. How long, Eternal Justice! how long shall a system of property prevail by which countless millions are made to suffer, that a few may live and flourish in royal splendor?

I hardly know where to stop when this matter of man's inhumanity to his fellow, this injustice and inequality, become my theme; and, should it seem to the reader that I am overdoing the matter, the in-

tensity of my feelings upon the subject must be my apology. A more touching appeal to the sympathies of the reader might, no doubt, have been made by harrowing up the feelings through the recital of instances of suffering and distress among the poor, but, as said at the commencement of the subject, this did not seem as important to the writer as to try to impress upon the mind of the reader *his own responsibility* for the multitudinous wrongs which are daily being committed by the stronger against the weaker portion of humanity.

If the writer has been as successful in this as he allows himself to hope, poverty will henceforth be likely to be viewed in a somewhat different light by readers of this work at least, and they will be very likely to appeal to themselves, asking if they may not be individually responsible for the hardships and sufferings of their kind, rather than attempt shuffling the responsibility off upon the poor, or upon a Creator.

They will be able to discover, I hope, that it not only behooves them to make a determined effort to alleviate the sufferings of the poor so far as it may be practicable and prudent under the existing order of things; but that some more effectual remedy for the curse of poverty is required, which is no less than the extirpation of the system of private property, root and branch.

Now, taking a brief retrospective view of the matter under discussion in this chapter—a general view of the existing condition of human life in our Republic—what do we behold? Do we not discover mankind chained down under a system of property that

makes life in a measure a burden and a curse to all classes alike? By the strong arm of *might*, afforded by wealth, we behold the opulent few, while not in a condition themselves for reaping much happiness from life, ruling over the classes below them, subjecting their lives to perpetual slavery, toil, anxiety, suffering, and miseries.

Before closing this chapter I would speak more particularly than I have yet done of an evil generated in the great majority of cases out of the system of private property, which affects *all classes* of mankind. I refer to that abominable curse, War.

It is not the purpose of the writer to make an attempt to delineate the woes, waste, and wretchedness arising from war, for, like the miseries and sorrows of the abject poor, these facts are so apparent to all as to require no further illustration; but after the method in which the case of the poor has been treated in this chapter, the writer's purpose here will be to endeavor to impress upon his readers a sense of their own *individual responsibility* for the awful fact that in this age of the world an institution fraught with such manifold evils should still find sufferance upon the earth. Great as are the evils of war, we are still confronted by the indubitable fact that so long as mankind continue to conform to the barbarous method of governing by force—which will be so long as the system of private property remains—so long will this curse of war continue to afflict the race. As with individuals, so with nations; —so long as their interests remain hostile—as cannot be otherwise under the existing system of property—so long will remain this continual strife for

power and conquest, and so long must the earth be deluged with human blood.

The same selfishness actuates nations that actuates individuals, the desire of each and every citizen, as a rule, being to see his own nation grow rich and strong, regardless at what expense or injustice toward other nations the prosperity of his own may be promoted. And this inhuman, selfish sentiment is called Patriotism, and is lauded almost universally as something but little less than divine. From the bottom of my heart I abhor such a sentiment—denounce it with my whole soul; and were I a believer in his Satanic Majesty, horned, cloven, and tailed, as orthodoxy represents him, I would regard this sentiment called Patriotism as one which he had subtly instilled into the hearts of men to further his own accursed purposes.

What in the name of common sense or humanity makes my brother man—a brother possibly by blood—who happens to live across the boundary of my state, yet within a stone's throw, and whose relations with me have ever been the most cordial, my *enemy*—compels me even to take up arms against him at the call of my ruler, or rulers, fighting him to the death perhaps of us both? Yet not to do this, if commanded by my ruler, insures my being denounced as unpatriotic and base, yea more, even makes me liable to be arraigned, tried, sentenced, and shot. Great omnipotence! are we sensible, sober, civilized, and human, or are mankind nothing yet upon the earth but a swarm of idiotic, reckless, barbarous, bloodthirsty savages, little better than the worst brute that roams the forest or jungle?

What is my country, and who are my countrymen? *My* country is the entire surface of the planet upon which I dwell, and *my* countrymen are all who are formed in my image, be they civilized, semi-civilized, or barbarous; be they white, black, or copper-colored. Whoever bears the stamp of humanity is my brother; and artificial, man-created, boundary lines having the effect of dividing mankind into hostile nationalities, or made hostile upon the slightest pretext, setting men at enmity with each other, I hold to be exceedingly inhuman. I know very well what I attack in raising my voice against this sentiment of patriotism. If noticed at all, it will be met with the same spirit of ridicule and scorn, the same fierce denunciations, as are hurled against those who would subvert the system of private property, the foster mother of the patriotic sentiment, which inherits from her its selfishness, exclusiveness, inhumanity, and brutality. "Ah," says one, "then according to the doctrine of this wiseacre our Washingtons, Jeffersons, Franklins, Lincolns, Grants, and a multitude of others whose names and memories we have been taught to revere as among the wisest and noblest of the race, in rendering their patriotic services to their country, have lived, suffered, labored, fought, bled, and died in vain."

Softly, my dear sir; I revere these names as much as you do or can; they are the names of such as strove manfully to promote the welfare of their race according to the light given them, and as such are deserving of the highest honors of a grateful people. But what was it, let me ask, that these self-sacrificing heroes fought for? Was it to establish or maintain

a despotic government, such as the system of private property naturally generates, or was it not rather to extend the liberty of the individual as far as such liberty might be extended under the existing property system? This is what they strove for, and for this their names deserve our reverence. But, after all, they did not lay the ax to the root of the tree.

They were what Gambetta called Opportunists; that is, they endeavored to establish and maintain the best government possible for them to devise and maintain under the private property system. I would establish the best government possible to man's device, regardless of all pre-existing systems, and this is wherein I differ from them upon this point.

Their efforts were successful, too, in a measure; but the sequel has already shown that the corner-stone upon which these noble men built stood upon an infirm foundation, and that no rearing of a new superstructure, or patching up of an old one, can be adequate to the end which they had in view.

It is, I repeat, the system of private property, both individual and national, and the false views arising from this system, that have given birth to that false sentiment of patriotism which has so deluded and blinded mankind that, inhuman and abominable as it is in its consequences, it has made itself appear to them a virtue. And so it is that one evil ever follows another in the world. Starting upon the false and unjust system of private property as a basis, mankind see no other way in which the rights of property and the safety of the person can be protected than by sustaining the government

which protects these; and so, right or wrong, they are bound to spring to the national rescue when called upon, clutching at the throats of their fellows until one or the other of the parties are vanquished.

Are not you, O man and woman, every one of you, responsible in some degree for this atrocious public sentiment which leads directly to the most terrible woes and wretchedness that can possibly afflict mankind? What can mankind be thinking about that they suffer themselves to live, apparently indifferent, in a world where such outrages upon humanity are continually going on, and while they themselves are all more or less the direct sufferers, without making the least effort toward their prevention? Would that I had a voice that would reach the uttermost parts of the earth, that I might thunder in the ears of every lethargic sleeper *his own responsibility* that an evil so monstrous as war should still be cherished and maintained upon the earth. Above all, attempt no longer, because you cannot discover how the nefarious and unjust system of private property can be maintained without force, leading to war and all its direful consequences, to shuffle the onus of the responsibility off upon a Creator. Could there be such a thing as insulting the Infinite, I know of no offense that would be equally insulting to that of charging a Creator with the ordination of these hellish life-struggles between man and man.

Look at the brutalizing effect which war has upon the whole race of mankind. What but to materially lower the moral standard and brutalize the individual must be the legitimate effect of this partitioning

off into separate nationalities, under auspices which naturally make mankind the foes of each other, while each is sustained by a public sentiment that regards merely the interests and aggrandizement of its own, and which, in promoting those interests, regards not the wanton destruction of property, nor holds the lives and welfare of his fellow-beings above those of the brute? There is but one way that I can discover to avoid this accursed evil of war that so brutalizes mankind, and that is to do away with a system that institutes these dividing lines and makes mankind the natural foes of each other. A system of common property knowing no dividing lines would accomplish this; and so we see that, look where we will, this system of private property is sure to be found the root of all evil.

We have seen in this chapter that the condition of neither of the three classes into which we find society divided in our republic, under the existing system of private property, is a condition which, to the vast majority of mankind, can hardly make life worth living upon our fair earth; and now, when we come to regard this system of property in a more general or *national* light, we find it also the chief promoter of the most atrocious evils that have ever afflicted humanity.

"Ah me, ah me!" as Carlyle was wont to exclaim, what a very Pandora's box of evils we have indeed found this execrable system of private property to be!

Nine-tenths of all the evils to which the family of man fall heir may be traced directly to it—a very hot-house of hell in which all manner of evils are generated and forced to the most exuberant growth.

CHAPTER XIV.

EXAMINATION OF THE OBJECTIONS TO COMMUNISM.

HAVING, to the best of my ability, portrayed life in the Future Republic, and contrasted it with life in the present age, I now propose to consider, in a fair and candid manner, the objections against Communism, with a view to show that the so-called difficulties of the communal system of property are generally, if not always, more imaginary than real.

John Stuart Mill has treated Communism more fairly and candidly than any other able writer and thinker who, while not committed as favoring its theories, has written upon the subject. But, though Mr. Mill has raised objections against the Communistic system, he cannot really be considered as having been an opponent of it, as he distinctly says that "Communism has a case for trial and that its theories—the ideal society which it holds up for the attainment of mankind—are by no means to be scouted or pronounced impracticable of realization." When such words of cheer come from so profound a thinker as Mr. Mill we can bear with serenity and complaisance the slang of the shallow babbler who treats the subject as if it were born of imbecility and madness, and had not a leg to stand upon.

In the February, March, and April, 1879, numbers of the "Fortnightly Review" may be found the post-

humous work of Mr. Mill upon Socialism, from which I shall here quote to some considerable extent. In his introduction to this work, Mr. Mill says:

"At the ordinary pace of those great social changes which are not effected by physical violence we have before us an interval of about a generation on the due employment of which it depends whether the accommodation of social institutions to the altered state of human society shall be the work of wise foresight or of a conflict of opposite prejudices. The future of mankind will be gravely imperiled if great questions are left to be fought over between ignorant change and ignorant opposition to change. And the discussion that is *now required* is one that must go down to the very first principles of existing society. The fundamental doctrines which were assumed as incontestable by former generations are now put again on their trial. Until the present age the institution of property, in the shape in which it has been handed down from the past, had not, except by a few speculative writers, been brought seriously into question, because the conflicts of the past have always been conflicts between classes, both of which had a stake in the existing constitution of property. It will not be possible to go on longer in this manner. When the discussion includes classes who have next to no property of their own, and are only interested in the institution so far as it is a public benefit, they will not allow anything to be taken for granted—certainly not the principle of private property, the legitimacy and utility of which are denied by many of the reasoners who look out from the standpoint of the working classes. Those classes will certainly

demand that the subject in all its parts shall be re-considered from the foundation; that all proposals for doing without the institution, and all modes of modifying it which have the appearance of being favorable to the interest of the working classes, shall receive the fullest consideration and discussion before it is decided that the subject must remain as it is."

Mr. Mill then goes on to ask if poverty and the ills that follow it are necessary evils; and says:

"They are told so by those who do not feel it—by those who have gained the prizes in the lottery of life. But," he continues, "it was also said that slavery, that despotism, that all the privileges of oligarchy were necessary. . . . Considering that the opinions of mankind have been found so wonderfully flexible, have always tended to consecrate existing facts, and to declare what did not yet exist, either pernicious or impracticable, what assurance have those classes that the distinction of rich and poor is grounded on a more imperative necessity than those other ancient and long-established facts which, having been abolished, are now condemned even by those who formerly profited by them?

"The working classes are entitled to claim that the whole field of social institutions should be re-examined and every question considered as if it now arose for the first time, with the idea constantly in view that the persons who are to be convinced are not those who owe their ease and importance to the present system, but persons who have no other interest in the matter than abstract justice and the general good of the community." Mr. Mill, in bringing forward the

requires the greatest effort at times to even partially overcome.

You say, perhaps, that if pondering over these matters disturbs and casts a gloom over the mind, then why do this? why not accept existing things as our fathers have handed them down to us, troubling ourselves not as to whether they be right or wrong? I answer that I cannot throw off these great questions in any such light way. The fact that they do disturb the mind when pondering over them, that inherent principles of monstrous injustice between man and man are plainly discernible as I turn them over in my mind, prevents me from casting them off lightly. Like Banquo's ghost, they will not down, but fasten themselves to me continually, asleep or awake. And let me tell you, reader, that such questions have got to be met and grappled, and that you and I, and every human being who walks the footstool of earth, are *individually responsible* to the future generations of humanity for the action which we take in meeting and righting them. Men *must have* their minds disturbed by them; must toil, suffer, and die if needs be, in righting the wrongs that exist in society, before we can have a world in which it may be truly said that it is a joy to live. How, think you, should we be regarded by a dweller in the New Republic who had never witnessed life under any other aspect than as it existed in the society in which he had been reared, were he set down in the streets of New York, or anywhere else upon the face of the earth, beholding the poverty, misery, and wretchedness that everywhere prevail? I should say that he would be likely to regard us as animals but a trifle above the brute,

morally speaking, and that he would probably seek his escape as speedily as possible out of the inhuman country.

Such is precisely the view we should be likely to take had we not been reared in the midst of all this indigence and misery, becoming hardened to it through its prevalence, and having also been taught to believe that it was ordained by an all-wise and beneficent Creator for some very wise purpose. Wise purpose, indeed, for a beneficent Creator to be the author of anything so inhuman as to offend even the sense of justice in puny man!

Poverty is man's work alone, and, as a rule, the responsibility falls upon the middle and opulent classes. How narrow-minded and unjust the attempt, which is so often made, for casting the onus for their poverty upon the poor themselves. Intemperance, imprudence, and laziness are the causes generally assigned for poverty. There is, of course, no questioning the fact that these evils intensify poverty; and, in so far, the poor may rightly be held responsible for augmenting their own sufferings; but we must dig deeper than this for the most potent cause of poverty. The man who is addicted to all these vices may not be drunk half as often, and probably does not waste a fraction of that which is wasted by his opulent brother, while the former has produced more, probably, in a month than the latter in all his life; and yet the one is pinched by poverty while the other has all the superabundance that flows from riches.

Again, millions suffer from poverty who are not addicted to any of the evils above mentioned. A vast

claims that under the existing system of property competition produces cheapness in products.

Now, whatever may be the facts as to these questions, they fail to meet the subject of competition as Socialists present it. The main object of the writers —quotations from whom are cited at the close of Chapter VIII., and whom Mr. Mill is here criticising —is to show that the evils they name, prevalent under the existing system of property, competition with its pernicious results being among the number, *cannot be removed under the present property system.* Hence, while Mr. Mill may or may not be correct in his argument, he does not touch upon the vital point at issue.

Again, Mr. Mill thought that there was a misapprehension on the part of Socialists and others relative "to the proportions in which the produce of the country is really shared and the amount of which is actually diverted from those who produce it to enrich other persons."

This criticism has already been so completely answered in this work that it is quite unnecessary to follow it further; and I will only remark that it seems wonderfully strange to me that one with the sagacity of Mr. Mill should have thought it possible to overestimate that which is diverted from the producers to enrich non-producers.

As regards the land, Mr. Mill says he will forbear to speak, but with respect to capital employed in business, there is in the popular notions a great deal of illusion. "Of the profits," he says, "which a manufacturer or other person in business obtains from his capital no more than about three per cent.

can be set down to the capital itself. The remainder of his profits is properly the remuneration of his skill and industry—the wages of his labor of superintendence." He acknowledges that if the business is very successful the price which he gets for his superintendence is extremely liberal, but after deducting losses, etc., he thinks that the net profit realized "is much smaller than it appears to the popular imagination." This may be so, but the "popular imagination" is founded in this case, I take it, upon what our eyes discover about us. If what Mr. Mill attempts to show here be really as he says, how is it that manufacturers and employers usually get rich, while employees but little if anything more than maintain a bare existence? No, Mr. Mill, I think, was clearly wrong upon this point; he evidently lacked experience, and derived his information from interested parties.

I would not underrate or undervalue that talent for organization and management in the employer by which the production of the employees may be greatly enhanced, and freely admit that, whenever such skill is made available by the employer, he becomes in effect a producer also, and this to a greater extent than any of his employees; but I deny his moral right to draw as remuneration for his skill such a proportion from the profits of the joint production as shall enable him to live in affluence, while his employees are merely able to exist.

This difference of remuneration is precisely what the present order of society admits, and even sanctions, while the higher order of Communism denounces it as immoral and unjust, and avers that

mankind can never reach a high social position, a position which insures peace, prosperity, and happiness upon the earth, while such injustice continues.

Another objection raised by Mr. Mill is that "the interests which foster material success in the directing minds—and directing minds there must ever be—would not be equal under Communism to what they are under the existing system." We do not deny this, but instead of its being an objection to Communism, we hold that it speaks volumes in its favor. It is these enormous personal interests which, under the system of private property cause the fearful competition and all its attendant evils that we have attempted to depict, and that we desire to see brought to a successful termination.

But I have mistaken my skill if I have not shown that, in the good-natured rivalry which existed between the communities of the New Republic, there was a motive power sufficiently potent to insure all needful success in a material point of view; as also that under the Communistic system of society the intellectual and moral faculties may find the fairest field for their development. But, leaving the ideal and coming down to the real, we find in the Lebanon and Oneida Communities before referred to a demonstration that sufficient interest has been, and still is, manifested in the "directing minds" of these communities to establish and maintain them in an economical point of view (which is all that Mr. Mill is speaking of) far above that of the individual system by which they are surrounded.

From these illustrations I think it is fairly shown that we do even our present state of society injustice

by alleging that, out of every two hundred average people—a number as small, probably, as would usually be reached in a community—a few directing minds could not be found actuated by a sense of duty, honor, and public spirit sufficiently high, and coupled also with the required ability and integrity for establishing and maintaining a community that would be successful in an economic point of view; and this, too, without further remuneration than a joint interest in the association. And if these may be found, reared under the demoralizing influences of the present system of property, how little should we have to fear when the "directing minds," as well as the rank and file, are trained under unselfish Communistic principles. As Mr. Mill correctly observes, "to effectually train men and women for Communism, they should be educated under Communistic influences."

But when we come to the ordinary laborers, Mr. Mill candidly admits "considerable advantages arising to them under Communistic organization over the present system, and this for the reason that each laborer holds a joint share in the common interest." He thought, however, that this advantage might be overcome to some extent under the system of private property by introducing more generally what is called industrial partnerships, that is, "the admission of the whole body of laborers to a participation in the profits, by distributing among all who share in the work, in the form of a percentage on their earnings, the whole or a fixed portion of the gains after a certain remuneration has been allowed to capital;" a sort of half Communistic plan, it will be observed, but

highly commendable, as it is through such beginnings that the desired end is to be reached. We notice in the last-quoted sentence—as we often find in his writings—that even a mind like Mr. Mill's could not work its way through the many difficulties of our existing property system, so as to define how equal justice might be allotted to all without devising something embracing the elements of Communism.

Other sources of discord, Mr. Mill thought, would be found under the Communistic *regime*, arising out of various individual views upon the subject of education; the mode of employing the productive resources of the association; the condition of social life; the relations of the body with other associations, etc.; but as he does not go into the particulars of these subjects, and as they have already been sufficiently answered in this work, nothing further need be said here.

But there are other difficulties which Mr. Mill thinks would be found in the workings of Communism that are "inherent in the system." One of these is "the rendering of equal remuneration when the services performed must necessarily be unequal, from unequal capacities for labor both mental and bodily;" and another "the unequal hardness and unpleasantness of the different kinds of labor to be performed."

Under that high order of Communism which the writer has endeavored to shadow forth in this work, he fails to discover how the first of these objections can have any pertinency whatever, as each has all the reward for his labor that it is possible for mankind to enjoy, and what more can he ask? The other

difficulty, if difficulty it is, would be very trifling indeed under an established universal system of collective property. In the chapter of this work pointing out the workings of the industrial system in the New Republic, the writer has noted the fact that a *change of employment* was customary, which could easily be so managed as to nearly, if not quite, overcome any hardship that might arise from different kinds of employment.

Mr. Mill suggests that such change of employment, however, would be likely to involve some sacrifice in an economic point of view. At first glance such a course would seem to involve some sacrifice in this way; and such, no doubt, would be the fact at present. Take a blacksmith from his shop, or a farm-laborer from the field, and put him into an office to do the duties of a commercial clerk, and he would at first certainly be likely to make rather sorry work of it. But let men become accustomed to these changes of employment from their youth, as in the New Republic; let the farm laborer early accustom himself to turn his hand to some mechanical employment or commercial duty, and *vice versa*, and would not this difficulty very nearly vanish?

Of course tastes and natural adaptation should be regarded in making these changes of employment. It would not always be wise to send the natural-born mechanic into the counting-house, or the agriculturist into the mechanic's workshop, but the question is, might not such changes be made as a rule without any material sacrifice in an economic point of view when men have become habituated to this kind of change in the earlier days of life?

My own judgment is that any sacrifice in an economic point of view which such changes would be likely to involve from a lack of natural adaptation—where this was not too decided—would, if in no other way, be more than offset economically by the health and vigor naturally imparted by the change. But, after all, the question is not whether, in some minor points, the economic interests of the people might not be disadvantageously affected by a change from the system of private to a system of collective property; but the grand question is, What would be the *general result?* As to this, enough has already been said in these writings, and we need not follow the matter further here. But, while neither of the points under consideration referred to by Mr. Mill as difficulties would seem to bear much weight when applied to a universal system of collective property, they both are pertinent and must be regarded as difficulties to be met in the transition from the system of private, to the system of collective property. This element of selfishness, that has been nourished by the system of private property until it has become a thing of huge and monstrous size, we need not expect is going to disappear at our bidding; but rather that, in our transition state, it will be sure to meet us at every turn.

A community endeavoring to establish themselves under a system of collective property, with the system of private property in vogue all around them, must expect that the difficulties here mentioned by Mr. Mill will arise; but as showing that these difficulties need not be regarded as insuperable, or even momentous in an economic view, witness again the

material prosperity of the Lebanon and Oneida Communities.

Another objection which Mr. Mill raises is that, "as Communism excludes rivalry in matters of a material sense, the selfish ambition of mankind will betake itself with greater intensity to the domain still open to it, and we may expect that the struggles for pre-eminence, and for influence in the management, will be of great bitterness when the personal passions, diverted from their ordinary channel, are driven to seek their principal gratification in that other direction." The reader will find this objection fully met, I think, in the chapter treating upon the election of public officers for the community.

But what Mr. Mill thought was more to be feared than any dissensions which might be expected to arise under Communism was "a delusive unanimity produced by the prostration of all individual opinions and wishes before the decree of the majority." "The obstacles to human progress," he says, "are always great and require a concurrence of favorable circumstances to overcome them; but an indispensable condition of their being overcome is that human nature should have freedom to expand spontaneously in various directions both in thought and practice; that people should both think for themselves and try experiments for themselves, and should not resign into the hands of rulers, whether acting in the name of a few or of the majority, the business of thinking for them and of prescribing how they shall act. But in Communistic associations private life would be brought in a most unexampled degree within the dominion of public authority, and there

would be less scope for the development of individual character and individual preferences than has hitherto existed among the full citizens of any state belonging to the progressive branches of the human family. Already in all societies the compression of individuality by the majority is a great and growing evil; it would probably be much greater under Communism, except so far as it might be in the power of individuals to set bounds to it by selecting, to belong to a community, persons like-minded with themselves."

What is regarded as a strong point against Communism being embraced in the above, I have been careful to quote Mr. Mill here quite complete. Now, as to the importance of individuality in thought, opinion, belief, I fully concur with Mr. Mill. That progress has been and still is held back to a most frightful degree through stupidity or lethargy of thought among the masses, allowing a few, and this few by no means always the wisest or best, to think for them and to form their opinions and beliefs, is too palpable to require demonstration. Nothing is clearer than that men should think for themselves, investigate, study, compare, and form their own opinions and beliefs, in order to get on intelligently and prosperously in the world. I am no hero-worshiper, and will not accept the opinion of any individual upon any important subject that affects my own happiness, except such opinion be in harmony with my own judgment. To the end, therefore, that every individual may be put in as true a position as possible for arriving at intelligent and correct opinions and beliefs concerning that which affects his happi-

ness, it is indispensable that he should think for himself, form his own opinions and beliefs; and, moreover, that he should be allowed the fullest freedom of speech and action compatible with the maintenance of the rights of others. Opinion, belief, thought, as I have said in a former chapter, should be as free as the winds; but when we come to *conduct* or action in general, and sometimes, though much more rarely, to speech, there is always a boundary beyond which the individual may not pass. Let it not be thought from what is here said, however, that I would place iron-bound shackles upon speech, conduct, or action in general; for none honors more than myself the individual who has the courage to live up to his opinions and beliefs, or to express unreservedly his thoughts where either of these may differ from the current public views, providing that in so doing he encroach not upon the rights of others. Public opinion is the best guide to be had of right conduct —though public opinion has no right to prescribe or restrain a proper expression of individual opinion— while action in general should have for its guide the well-being of all. But while I agree fully with Mr. Mill as to the importance of endeavoring to secure and maintain a more complete and extended individuality of thought, opinion, and belief, I cannot admit that under such Communistic associations as have been depicted in this work individuality would be in any manner limited or restrained. On the contrary, there would, in my belief, be extended to such individuality a far wider scope for development than under existing institutions. Mr. Mill, in forming his judgment here, has unquestionably been influenced

objections to the present order of society as presented by Socialists, reminds the reader that, "when item after item of the enumeration passes before him, and he finds one fact after another which he has been accustomed to include among the necessities of nature urged as an accusation against social institutions, he is *not* entitled to cry unfairness and to protest that the evils complained of are inherent in man and society and are such as no arrangements can remedy. . . . To assert this would be to beg the very question at issue. . . . Moral evils and such physical evils as would be remedied if all persons did as they ought are fairly chargeable against the state of society which admits of them and are valid as arguments until it is shown that any other state of society would involve an equal or greater amount of such evils."

In depicting poverty Mr. Mill says:

"The condition of numbers in civilized Europe, and even in England and France, is more wretched than that of most tribes of savages who are known to us. It may be said that of this hard lot no one has any reason to complain, because it befalls those only who are outstripped by others from inferiority of energy or of prudence. This, even were it true, would be a very small alleviation of the evil. If some Nero or Domitian were to require a hundred persons to run a race for their lives, on the condition that the fifty or twenty who came in hindmost should be put to death, it would not be any diminution of the injustice that the strongest or nimblest would, except through some untoward accident, be certain to escape. The misery and the crime would be that any

were put to death at all. So, in the economy of society; if there be any who suffer physical privation or moral degradation, whose bodily necessities are either not satisfied or satisfied in a manner which only brutish creatures can be content with, this, though not necessarily the crime of society, is *pro tanto* a failure of the social arrangements. And to assert as a mitigation of the evil that those who thus suffer are the weaker members of the community morally or physically, is *to add insult to misfortune.* Is weakness a justification of suffering? Is it not, on the contrary, an irresistible claim upon every human being for protection against suffering? . . . .

"One thing there is which, if it could be affirmed truly, would relieve social institutions from any share in the responsibilty of these evils. Since the human race has no means of enjoyable existence, or of existence at all, but what it derives from its own labor and abstinence, there would be no ground for complaint against society if every one who was willing to undergo a fair share of this labor and abstinence could attain a fair share of the fruits. But is this the fact? Is it not the reverse of the fact? The reward, instead of being proportioned to the labor and abstinence of the individual, is almost in an inverse ratio to it: those who receive the least, labor and abstain the most. Even the idle, reckless, and ill-conducted poor, those who are said with most justice to have themselves to blame for their condition, often undergo much more and severer labor, not only than those who are born to pecuniary independence, but than almost any of the more highly remunerated of those who earn their subsistence; and even the

inadequate self-control exercised by the industrious poor costs them more sacrifice and more effort than is almost ever required from the more favored members of society. The very idea of distributive justice or of any proportionality between success and merit, or between success and exertion, is in the present state of society so manifestly chimerical as to be relegated to the regions of romance. . . . . These evils then, great poverty, and that poverty very little connected with desert, are the first grand failure of the existing arrangements of society. The second is human misconduct; crime, vice, and folly, with all the sufferings that follow in their train. For nearly all the forms of misconduct, whether committed toward ourselves or toward others, may be traced to one of three causes: Poverty and its temptations in the many; idleness and *desœuvrement* in the few whose circumstances do not compel them to work; bad education, or want of education, in both. The first two must be allowed to be at least failures in the social arrangements; the last is now almost universally admitted to be the fault of those arrangements—it may almost be said the crime."

I have quoted from Mr. Mill thus extensively for two reasons, namely: First, because the complaints which may be justly brought against the existing order of society are tersely and comprehensively stated; and, second, because I find an answer here given quite pertinent to a large class of empty egotists who discuss Socialism and Communism as if they were idle speculations unworthy the attention of sensible people.

And now to Mr. Mill's criticisms upon the theories

advanced or the positions taken by the Socialistic or Communistic writers. He commences by taking exception to Louis Blanc's statement that remuneration for ordinary labor was constantly diminishing.

Mr. Mill's opinion was that the facts did not bear out the assertion, though he admits that the wages for labor "are wretchedly insufficient to supply the physical and moral necessities of the population in any tolerable measure." He seemed to be of the opinion, however, that the rate of wages was gradually increasing instead of diminishing. I shall not attempt to follow this question, for, whatever may be the facts, it is a matter of no further importance connected with Communism than as showing either a gradual improvement or a retrograde tendency in the privileges extended to the working classes under the existing order of society. If an actual improvement in the privileges extended to the laboring classes under existing society were shown, that does not prove that these privileges may not be greatly extended, and their condition vastly improved, under Communism.

The objections which Mr. Mill makes to the argument of the Socialists upon Competition has already been answered to some extent in Chapter VIII.; but I would say here that I think Mr. Mill failed for the moment to keep in sight the fact that he was viewing the subject from a standpoint quite different from that of the writers with whom he appears to differ. Mr. Mill argues that in the case of labor competition works both ways; that while laborers may compete with each other to obtain employment, employers also compete for the laborer's services. He also

calls it, for personal acquisition, he certainly must mean the accumulation of property beyond that of man's daily wants—his present necessities—for he would admit, no doubt, that a system of common property would furnish all this.

Unquestionably what Mr. Spencer must mean, when he speaks of gratifying this inherent desire for property, is that we may accumulate capital, lay up something upon which we may look as our own, either in the produce which has been furnished by the gifts of nature combined with man's labor, or its equivalent in dollars which it may not only gratify our souls to gaze upon but in hearing them chink also. Certainly, if this faculty of acquisitiveness is to be gratified, there must be something acquired beyond present necessities, and in a quantity, too, sufficient to afford the desired gratification.

To labor merely to keep the pot boiling cannot, I take it, afford very much gratification to this instinctive faculty of acquisitiveness. Now, let me ask Mr. Spencer what portion of mankind, under the existing system of private property, he really thinks find scope for gratifying this faculty or instinct of acquisitiveness. His own answer, I think, must be: A very small proportion compared to the number of mankind upon the earth. And is this number likely to be increased; or rather, in proportion to the whole, is it not likely to become diminished under a continuance of the private property system? Is not the wealth of our own land, as of other lands, daily becoming concentrated in the hands of the few, whose instinct of acquisitiveness may no doubt be gratified beyond measure; and are not the numbers

of those who cannot gratify in the least this "instinctive faculty" becoming more and more augmented both in numbers and proportionably?

Mr. Spencer must know this to be the case, and he knows well, too, that such are the legitimate results which arise out of a system of private property. I am warranted in saying this because the facts are notorious and obvious even to the most commonplace observer. How, then, is this instinctive faculty of acquisitiveness to be gratified by the vast mass of humanity under the private property system? The above being true, taking the very grounds upon which Mr. Spencer rests his argument—scope for gratifying that element of our nature which desires property—I hold that the system of private property is not the correct system, for it virtually extends this scope to but a *comparatively few*, and that the system of collective or common property *is the correct system*, for it extends to *all* the scope for gratifying this faculty of acquisitiveness to the fullest normal extent. Under the system of collective property *every* individual has a personal acquisition—a share which he may properly regard as his own, for it is his own though undivided—which is a source of gratification to that element of our nature which prompts us to accumulate for the purpose of self-preservation.

I will quote here a portion of Webster's definition of property. "Property," he says, "is sometimes held in common, yet each man's right to his share in common land or stock is *exclusively* his own."

A Rothschild or a Vanderbilt might not be satisfied with a share in a community association, but, on

the other hand, multitudes of wretched beings who have never looked upon any accumulated capital that they themselves had any personal share in would rejoice and be gratified beyond measure to hold such a personal acquisition. And so these abnormal propensities for gathering riches would be brought down to their proper or normal level under the system of collective property, while on the other hand the poverty-stricken would be given an opportunity for enjoying the acquisition of property — an "instinctive" gratification which most of them can never know under the existing property system.

But it is only fair to afford Mr. Spencer the opportunity for escaping from the dilemma here pointed out, and into which he has no doubt quite unconsciously fallen, by opening up for him the side-door which he took good care to have constructed at the commencement of his "Social Statics," and through which he has so often found it convenient to make his exit. Mr. Spencer, like the writer, believes in a future state of society that shall be *absolutely perfect*. All honor to him for the faith he exhibits in his kind. Mr. Spencer, therefore, in "Social Statics," plants himself upon a system of pure ethics as the basis of man in a perfect society, and, arguing from this standpoint, cannot take cognizance of evil.

Such a thing, therefore, as selfishness coming in to upset both his argument and the gratification of that "element of man's nature"—acquisitiveness — under the system of private property, he of course cannot recognize. But if, under our ideal perfect society, neither Mr. Spencer nor myself can find any room for selfishness, neither can I any more for *perverted*

acquisitiveness, which I regard as one of the most detestable forms of selfishness, and I feel confident that when mankind has reached that condition of society in which there shall be no injustice nor any sort of evil, ample scope for the normal gratification of acquisitiveness may be found under a system of collective property.

Now having turned against himself completely the argument which Mr. Spencer declares to be fatal to the Communistic theory, and through which he seems to have flattered himself that he was furnishing an impregnable bulwark behind which the system of private property might forever rest secure; and having, moreover, given the reader all the argument worthy of the slightest attention brought forward by Mr. Spencer against the common-property theory, let us now pass on to see what this scoffer has to say in regard to the right of property in land.

Upon this subject I am happy to say, at the outset, that Mr. Spencer's views fully accord with my own. "Equity," he says, "does not permit property in land. For if one portion of the earth's surface may justly become the possession of an individual, and may be held by him for his sole use and benefit, then other portions of the earth's surface may be so held, and eventually the whole of the earth's surface may be so held, and our planet may thus lapse altogether into private hands." Observe now the dilemma to which this leads. Suppose the entire habitable globe to be so inclosed, it follows that if the land owners have a valid right to its surface, all who are not land owners have no right at all to its surface.

Hence such can exist upon the earth by sufferance only. They are all trespassers.

"Save by the permission of the lords of the soil, they can have no room for the soles of their feet. Nay, should the others think fit to deny them a resting-place, these landless men might equitably be expelled from the earth altogether."

Nothing could be better than this, so far; but Mr. Spencer, evidently discovering whither his argument for making the land common property was leading him respecting the *fruits of the land*, now resorts to his convenient side-door again for making his exit out of this difficulty.

Let us hear him now upon the equitable right to hold individual property *exclusive* of the land. "The moral law," he says ("Social Statics," page 144), "being the law of the social state, is obliged wholly to ignore the ante-social state. Constituting, as the principles of pure morality do, a code of conduct for the perfect man, they cannot be made to adapt themselves to the actions of the uncivilized man, even under the most ingenious hypothetical condition—cannot be made even to recognize those actions so as to pass any definite sentence upon them. Overlooking this fact, thinkers, in their attempt to prove some of the first theorems of ethics, have commonly fallen into the error of referring back to an imaginary state of savage wildness, instead of referring forward to an ideal civilization, as they should have done; and have, in consequence, entangled themselves in difficulties arising out of the discordance between ethical principles and the assumed premises. To this circumstance is attributable that vagueness by which

the arguments used to establish the right of property in a logical manner are characterized. Whilst possessed of a certain plausibility, they yet cannot be considered conclusive; inasmuch as they suggest questions and objections that admit of no satisfactory answers." Mr. Spencer here quotes from Locke, to give a sample of such argument, as follows: "Though the earth and all the inferior creatures," says Locke, "be common to all men, yet every man has a property in his own person; this, nobody has a right to but himself. The labor of his body, and the work of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatever, then, he removes out of the state that nature hath provided and left it in, he hath mixed his labor with, and joined to it something that is his own and thereby makes it his property. It being by him removed from the common state nature hath placed it in, it hath by this labor something annexed to it that excludes the common right of other men. For this labor being the unquestionable property of the laborer, no man but he can have a right to what that is once joined to, at least when there is enough, and as good, left in common for others." Mr. Spencer then comments somewhat extensively upon the foregoing from Mr. Locke, and a portion of his remarks I find it necessary for my argument to reproduce here: "If inclined to cavil," Mr. Spencer says, "one might in reply to this observe that as, according to the premises, 'the earth and all the inferior creatures'—all things, in fact, that the earth produces—are 'common to all men,' the consent of all men must be obtained before any article can be equitably 'removed from the common state nature hath placed it in.' It

might be argued that the real question is overlooked, when it is said, that, by gathering any natural product, a man 'hath mixed his labor with it, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby made it his property;' for that the point to be debated is, whether he had any right to gather, or mix his labor with that, which, by the hypothesis, previously belonged to mankind at large. The reasoning used in the last chapter to prove that no amount of labor, bestowed by an individual upon a part of the earth's surface, can nullify the title of society to that part, might be similarly employed to show that no one can, by the mere act of appropriating to himself any wild unclaimed animal or fruit, supersede the joint claims of other men to it. It may be quite true that the labor a man expends in catching or gathering, gives him a better right to the thing caught or gathered, than any *one* other man; but the question at issue is, whether by labor so expended, he has made his right to the thing caught or gathered, greater than the pre-existing rights of *all* other men put together. And unless he can prove that he has done this, his title to possession cannot be admitted as a matter of *right*, but can be conceded only on the ground of convenience. Further difficulties are suggested by the qualification, that the claim to any article of property thus obtained is valid only 'when there is enough and as good left in common for others.' A condition like this gives birth to such a host of queries, doubts, and limitations, as practically to neutralize the general proposition entirely. It may be asked, for example — How is it to be known that enough is 'left in common for others?' Who can determine whether

what remains is as good as what is taken? How, if the remnant is less accessible? If there is *not* enough left in common for others, how must the right of appropriation be exercised? Why, in such a case, does the mixing of labor with the acquired object cease to exclude the common right of other men? Supposing enough to be attainable but not all equally *good*, by what rule must each man choose? Out of which inquisition it seems impossible to liberate the alleged *right* without such mutilations as to render it, in an ethical point of view, entirely valueless.

Following this, we have two very notable sentences from Mr. Spencer, which I would have the reader mark well: "Thus," he says, "as already hinted, we find that the circumstances of savage life render the principles of abstract morality inapplicable; for it is impossible under ante-social conditions to determine the rightness or wrongness of certain actions by an exact measurement of the amount of freedom assumed by the parties concerned. *We must not expect, therefore, that the right of property can be satisfactorily based upon the premises afforded by such a state of existence.*"

Mr. Spencer having now kindly furnished us with some of the most irrefutable and unanswerable arguments in favor of common property, by first showing that the earth cannot equitably be held as private property, and then refuting Mr. Locke at every point in his argument to establish the equitable right to hold private property in *other than the land*, and finally, having acknowledged, as well as conclusively shown, that the right to hold individual property is not demonstrable, except by presupposing a perfect

by having in his mind community associations that have been the outcome of some fanatical religious sentiment wholly proscribing individuality of opinion and belief, and, to a large extent, thought.

It will be remembered that, in our community, the power is always vested in the majority of its members. The officers are chosen for short terms only, and are subject at all times to deposal by the vote of the majority. Certainly, under such an arrangement, the opportunity for leading the members by the nose, or for repressing individuality, could not be very favorable. On the contrary, in such a community, would there not be a scope for individuality, a freedom for the exercise of individual thought and opinion, not only equal to but far beyond that of any example which we have hitherto had in the domain of government? I claim that there would; and I claim, furthermore, that in such a community the greatest liberty compatible with social order would be extended in all things. Would a people, planting themselves upon the moral sentiment as their guide, and this moral sentiment finding its exponent in public opinion (upon which, it will be remembered, our system of authority in the New Republic is based) be likely to put any censorship over or restraint upon a free expression of individual opinion? I think not, for public opinion can be wisely formed only by giving full scope to individual expression of opinion.

Would not, in fact, the authorized *directing minds* in such a government as I have foreshadowed tend to urge the fullest expression of individual thought and opinion to guide and instruct them in their own duties? Under the elective system portrayed in the

Future Republic, it will be seen that the ablest and most worthy citizens must almost necessarily be chosen as the directing minds; and that such should court a free exercise of individual thought and opinion for their own guidance in planning, devising, and acting for the welfare of the community or the communities at large, would seem to me a natural result. But while upon the one hand the officers of such a community as I have depicted would be likely to be influenced by individual opinions and suggestions of interest to the association, on the other hand, if competent—and the officers of such a community as I present would unquestionably be the most competent of its members—they would serve also as a balance-wheel to the community in preventing the adoption or execution of injudicious schemes through which individual delusion or ambition now so often leads to extravagance and waste. Had Mr. Mill halted for a moment to figure up the enormous *waste* which is constantly brought about by individual imprudence, lack of forethought, and action in general, he would have modified his views, I think, of the advantages to be derived by society at large from reckless individual experiments unchecked by some power acting with more deliberation.

I admit that in some instances there would be a control over individual *actions* more rigid than that existing under the present order of society. Compulsory labor, the effect which the close contact of community association naturally has upon behavior, and the severe penalty of outcastry when conduct has become unendurable, may be mentioned as instances of this rigidity. But in defense of such

powerful control over the actions of mankind, nothing further is needed, I think, than has already been said in the preceding chapters of this work.

The pleasant rivalries between the communities in the New Republic would act as a sufficient encouragement to invention and improvement; and thus incited to action and favored by the ample leisure hours granted the individual to be employed according to his inclination, are we not warranted in expecting that under our Communistic system, instead of the "obstacles to human progression" which Mr. Mill has pointed out, there would be, both in material things and in those higher attainments which expand and ennoble the soul, a marked progressive enthusiasm, activity, and realization? By relieving the individual of anxiety and care in providing for his material wants, by developing his faculties through early education, by placing him in a position to choose through his own natural bent of mind a calling to which he might devote his life and energies, whether it be art, invention, literature, or science; and by placing at his disposal ample time and facilities for the successful prosecution of whatever might be his choice of employment, Communism, instead of repressing individuality, provides lavishly for its growth and development. Were there nothing in life to which man might devote his thought and energies but the mere providing for material wants, it is quite possible that from the very ease with which such wants would be supplied the Communistic system would tend to render life stupid; but the Communistic theory recognizes wants, aims, desires, and possibilities, so much more exalted than this as

to render it, though essential, comparatively insignificant.

I have now followed Mr. Mill through his argument, taking up all the principal "obstacles" he has presented, which to his mind appeared to stand in the pathway of Communism, and made such comments upon them as to me have seemed applicable.

The conclusion reached by Mr. Mill from his examination and investigation was that 'the various schemes for managing the productive resources of the country by public instead of private agency, *have a case for trial*, and that some of them may eventually establish their claims to preference over the existing order of things, but at present are only workable by the *elite* of mankind, and they have yet to prove their power of training mankind at large to the state of improvement which they presuppose.' The real difference between the views of Mr. Mill and my own upon the subject is not wide. He did not share my implicit faith in the future universal acceptation and triumph of this new order of society, but he saw virtue enough in it to grant it a respectable hearing and consideration, and advocated its claims to a fair trial for proving its importance and worth.

What has impressed the writer, and, I think, will also the reader, is the meagerness of the objections which so profound a thinker as Mr. Mill has been able to raise against the workings of the Communistic theory. And certainly, when such a mind as Mr. Mill's has applied itself to the question of Socialism or Communism, and has found so little in it which he could object to, we may rest assured that the common outcry against it which every senseless

critic feels himself privileged to voice, rests on no very tenable basis.

As opposed to the frightful list of grievances, injustices, miseries, and wrongs which may be presented against the existing order of things, these objections are infinitesimal indeed, and I think the same view must have been reached by Mr. Mill, as he closes his essay with the following remarkable passage: "And, assuredly, the terrible case which, as we saw in a former chapter, Socialists are able to make out against the present economic order of society, demands a full consideration of all means by which the institution may have a chance of being made to work in a manner more beneficial to that large portion of society which at present enjoys the least share of its direct benefits."

The work of Mr. Mill's we have been reviewing being his last work—left incomplete, in fact, at his death—it is not a little cheering to know that the mind of so profound a thinker, of one who had given so much of his life to the study of social and economic questions, should turn at the last with so much favor toward Communism as a measure for righting social wrongs and solving the great problem of social order. As a distinguished writer who has dared say so much in behalf of Communism, in an age when it was notably unpopular, the memory of Mr. Mill will long be revered among the adherents of a cherished system which is their chief reliance for bringing peace, harmony, and happiness to men.

But if we are surprised at the meagerness and weight of the objections presented by Mr. Mill against the Communistic theory, what shall we think of those

brought forward by Mr. Herbert Spencer in "Social Statics?" It is true, Mr. Spencer has not treated the subject specially, as did Mr. Mill in the article just noticed; nevertheless, so long as he has noticed the subject at all, it may be fairly concluded that the arguments he offers against it seemed to him the most important and weighty that could be presented. But, strange as it may appear, the argument which Mr. Spencer calls "fatal to the Communistic theory" was entirely overlooked by so acute a mind as Mr. Mill's while treating specially of the subject. "An argument *fatal to the Communistic theory*," says Mr. Spencer, in "Social Statics," page 151, "is suggested by the fact that a desire for property is one of the elements of our nature." "If a propensity to personal acquisition be really a component of man's constitution, then that cannot be a right form of society which affords it no scope;" meaning, I suppose, that Communism cannot be a right system because it does not afford the desired scope. Assuming that the system of private property *does* afford the desired scope, Mr. Spencer argues that it must be retained as a "*divinely ordained*" *institution*.

Well, now, it seems to me that, although Mr. Spencer starts off here with quite a flourish of trumpets for demonstrating the futility of any system of common property, he has kindly, though unconsciously no doubt, favored us with an almost unexampled argument for extirpating the existing system of private property, and substituting the system of common or collective property in its stead.

When Mr. Spencer speaks of giving scope to this instinct, or component of man's constitution as he

skill upon the basis of a perfect society, he exhibits the coldest inhumanity toward his race. The sufferings and hardships of the poor he speaks of at times with the tenderest sympathy; and then, as if he were setting up tenpins to knock them down again, he insists that the poverty-stricken and distressed must be left to the tender mercies of a money-grabbing community, arguing that the state exceeds its rights in rendering them any assistance whatever. In fact, society is to be benefited by sweeping these "poor devils" out of existence as quickly as possible, in order that the selfish and brutal, but more fortunate, may have the better opportunity to flourish. Hear Mr. Spencer upon this topic: "Pervading all nature, we may see at work a stern discipline which is a little cruel that it may be very kind. That state of universal warfare maintained throughout the lower creation, to the great perplexity of many worthy people, is at bottom the most merciful provision which the circumstances admit of. It is much better that the ruminant animal, when deprived by age of the vigor which made its existence a pleasure, should be killed by some beast of prey, than that it should linger out a life made painful by infirmities, and eventually die of starvation. By the destruction of all such, not only is existence ended before it becomes burdensome, but room is made for a younger generation capable of the fullest enjoyment; and, moreover, out of the very act of substitution happiness is derived for a tribe of predatory creatures. Note, further, that their carnivorous enemies not only remove from herbivorous herds individuals past their prime, but

also weed out the sickly, the malformed, and the least fleet or powerful. By the aid of which purifying process, as well as by the fighting, so universal in the pairing season, all vitiation of the race through the multiplication of its inferior samples is prevented; and the maintenance of a constitution completely adapted to surrounding conditions, and therefore most productive of happiness, is insured. The development of the higher creation is a progress toward a form of being capable of a happiness undiminished by these drawbacks. It is in the human race that the consummation is to be accomplished—civilization is the last stage of its accomplishment. And the ideal man is the man in whom all the conditions of that accomplishment are fulfilled. Meanwhile the well-being of existing humanity, and the unfolding it into this ultimate perfection, are both secured by that same beneficent though severe discipline to which the animate creation at large is subject: a discipline which is pitiless in the working out of good: a felicity-pursuing law which never swerves for the avoidance of partial and temporary suffering. The poverty of the incapable, the distresses that come upon the imprudent, the starvation of the idle, and those shoulderings aside of the weak by the strong, which leave so many 'in shallows and in miseries,' are the decrees of a large, far-seeing benevolence. It seems hard that an unskilfulness which with all his efforts he cannot overcome should entail hunger upon the artisan. It seems hard that a laborer, incapacitated by sickness from competing with his stronger fellows, should have to bear the resulting privations.

"It seems hard that the widows and orphans should be left to struggle for life or death. Nevertheless, when regarded not separately, but in connection with the interests of universal humanity, these harsh fatalities are seen to be full of the highest beneficence —the same beneficence which brings to early graves the children of diseased parents, and singles out the low-spirited, the intemperate, and the debilitated as the victims of an epidemic."

Herein, O man, according to Mr. Spencer's philosophy, you may learn your fate and the true method by which to regulate your actions. Take the beast of the field as your guide to right conduct, and should a delusive emotion find place in your agonized heart, or flicker for a moment in your troubled brain, upon beholding human suffering, suppress it instantly as being *unbeastly*—hence, as unnatural and unworthy of you—that you may thus prepare yourself to meet the destiny of inexorable law with equanimity and with stoical, cheerful resignation.

You, white-haired, feeble old man, and you, old woman, who have outlived your days of usefulness, no matter if you were the authors of my being, my privilege and duty it is to get you out of the way as quickly as possible, that my opportunity for happiness may be enhanced. And you, consumptive daughter, your physician has given up all hopes of your recovery, and as his visits are expensive, as also the medicine we have to procure for you, and as by living you deprive my other children of material comforts, I think it is my duty to deprive you of both physician and medicine, and make life as uncomfortable to you as possible, that death may remove you

the more quickly. And you, poor half-starved, half-clad creatures whom we see about us upon every hand, deprived of the means of existence through unjust and inhuman institutions, to assist you would be but to prolong your miserable existence, and deprive others, whose places you fill, of much happiness they might otherwise enjoy. It is well, therefore, that this beneficent, inexorable law should step in to deprive you *all* of existence as speedily as possible, that well-developed, strong, selfish, and brutal bipeds may profit by your departure.

This may be considered a rather strong way of putting the case, and I acknowledge that it is; still I hold that these illustrations are legitimately deducible from the quotations given.

I would not have quoted Mr. Spencer to this extent were not his heartless philosophy held by a large class at the present day.

Now, what is this that generates and sanctions so heartless a philosophy? What is this that so quenches the fire of human sympathy within the breast? What is it that so allies man with the brute? Although a believer in it myself, I must confess that it looks as if belief in the doctrine of evolution were at the bottom of all this lack of human sympathy. And can it be possible that the great propounder of the doctrine himself has been thus affected by it?

There is an unswerving, immutable law, we are told, that controls the universe and shapes the destinies of men. Well, I believe in this inexorable law as shaping the destinies of mankind just to this extent, namely: just to the extent *to which effect follows cause*, and no farther. If we put our fingers in the

fire, we are quite sure to get burned; if we immerse ourselves in water and remain long enough, we are sure to be drowned; and if man devises and institutes inhuman laws and systems for the government and regulation of his kind, this unvarying law of cause and effect will secure to him the evil of which he is the generator; as, conversely, it would secure to him the good arising from just laws and systems; but, in either case, he is the arbiter of his own fate.

I therefore do not believe that there is an immutable law which is the arbiter of man's destiny, and against which he himself is powerless and hopeless. In such a belief lies a fatalism past all redemption, having the effect to subvert all effort toward the amelioration or improvement of the condition of the human race. In the process of evolution, which I believe to be ever toward the improvement of the condition of the race, I believe that men and women are generated who discover the ills of human life, the wrongs of inhuman and barbarous systems, and that it is through the influence and labors of such, which is effect following cause, that the condition of humanity is made better. But to me that view of evolution is erroneous and despicable which looks to blind force, unaided by human effort, to carry the world on its pathway of progression; which withholds human sympathy and human assistance, and counsels a grab-game wherein each is to look out for himself while the devil takes the hindmost.

In a sense, there is much truth in the doctrine of the "survival of the fittest," but the trouble is that, with human institutions as they now are, it is too often the *best* who are not fitted for the unnatural

environment with which they find themselves surrounded, and who have to go to the wall. It is not the more sympathetic and refined natures who usually live longest or flourish the best; it is usually the selfish, the brutal—those who have more of the animal than the spiritual in their natures. Let us make the world better, then, that the finer natures may dwell longer upon the earth, and leave to it a posterity that may continue to improve it.

Having noticed the objections which Mr. Mill and Mr. Spencer have brought against Communism, I may now bring this examination to a close, as the objections brought forward by them—in fact, I may say those brought forward by Mr. Mill alone—are all that may be regarded as having any real weight that have come under the notice of the writer. I admit that I have not searched far outside Mr. Mill's and Mr. Spencer's works for objections which may have been advanced against the working of the Communistic theory, for it has seemed to me that when such a mind as that of Mr. Mill has set itself to the task of ferreting out these objections, all of importance, we may rest assured, have been brought to light.

I have read a work by Theo. D. Woolsey, entitled "Communism and Socialism," which, though giving some valuable information respecting Communistic associations, presents no new objections to the Communistic theory that I regard as of sufficient importance to notice here.

The objections raised against Communism, current among superficial thinkers, or those who do not think at all, and which usually find expression in nothing

beyond "nonsenical," "impracticable," and a sneer, of course the writer will not be expected to trouble himself with. It is impossible to refute a sneer, it is said; but it is also quite as true that it is never worth refuting.

The intelligent man who has investigated a subject and holds to its impracticability should, of course, be listened to; but the slothful ignoramus who has never investigated, and is still so ready with his opinion, we can afford to ignore. There are many of these, however, and as they are always loudest in their vociferations, Progress has to carry them upon her shoulders.

CHAPTER XV.

METHODS PROPOSED FOR THE TRANSITION FROM THE SYSTEM OF INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY TO A SYSTEM OF COLLECTIVE PROPERTY.

BEFORE proceeding to point out the methods by means of which the system of collective property may be made practical in the United States, I would first state what, in my judgment, would of all modes be the most impolitic and the least likely to succeed. This is the attempt to reach the desired end through *violence*. I am strongly of the opinion that there is always a better and easier method for making such changes in the established order of society as are for the benefit of mankind, than a resort to force.

Great changes, like the subversion of old and long-cherished institutions, and the supplanting of them by new, must necessarily be slow in their progress if they are to prove permanent and successful when accomplished. How little we know of the silent but constant workings always active in the minds of men. Some one is inspired with a great truth, which he throws out enthusiastically upon the world; and so clear to him does it appear that he wonders why it is not immediately seized upon and adopted; yet it is received with such apparent apathy that, however confident he may be of its verity, its utility, and of its final triumph, he feels, at times, not a little disheart-

ened. The greater part of what he hears from others is likely to be adverse to his thesis; and yet, below this outer covering of swagger and contempt, the seed he has sown is silently springing to life, and bearing wonderful increase. And this is the true way to bring about changes in society. When great changes are forced prematurely upon mankind there is almost sure to be a reaction, throwing society back into something worse than its former condition, and to overcome which generations of time may be required. The history of France, and that of other nations, has verified this fact.

Were it possible for mankind to band together in our republic to-day, overthrow the government and the system of private property, and divide up all the possessions equally, anarchy and rapine would reign, until, possibly, some dictator should arise, gather his supporters about him, sweep over the land, and lay the whole nation suppliant at his feet. History substantiates the fact that, where governments have been violently overthrown, leaving the people in a state of anarchy and confusion, the usual method of establishing order again is through a dictatorship, or something so closely allied to it as to be practically the same. Now suppose a sudden and thorough change had taken place in the government and property system of this republic, what, think you, would be the next step? Would it, in any probability, be a new government based upon the system of common property? I am sufficiently optimistic, so far as having confidence in my fellow-men is concerned, but I am not optimist enough to entertain a hope here, as it would be against all past history of how human

beings act under similar circumstances. Without the example of a government previously existing under the system of collective property, more than likely without ever having studied the theory, or having matured any plan for the constructing of a government with such a property basis; and, moreover, having before his eyes the direful consequences of the attempt to force the system upon the nation, it is in nowise supposable that, even if the dictator desired to do what was best for the people, he would favor the establishing of the system of common property. The probable course would be the portioning off of large tracts of lands to his officers and favorites, after the plan of the Norman conqueror in Great Britain; ultimately the dictator would be made a king or emperor who would rule with a despotic hand, and our last state would be a thousand times worse than our first.

No, the system of collective property, in my judgment, is not likely ever to be forced upon mankind. The change must be brought about in a quiet, peaceful manner, by demonstrating its advantages in a thousand ways. Schiller somewhere says: "The path of mere power to its object is that of the cannon ball, direct and rapid, but destroying everything in its course, and destructive even to the end it reaches. Not so the road of human usages, which is beaten by the old intercourse of life; that path winds this way and that; along the river, or around the orchard, and securely though slowly arrives at last to its destined end. That is the road on which blessings travel."

Now a few words relative to another method which

state of society and resting the argument upon this basis, he has left little to be said, by the writer, upon the subject. But as the only argument which Mr. Spencer has attempted to bring forward to prove under his presupposed condition of a perfect society the equitable right to hold private property, is that the faculty of acquisitiveness might find free scope to fulfil its normal functions; and, as I have already pointed out what that scope is, and what it must inevitably continue to be under the system of private property, the reader is in a position, I think, for forming a pretty correct opinion as to the weight of this argument.

The real truth is that individual property, whether in land or the fruits of the land, stands upon no better or other basis than the infernal sophism that "might makes right," and when the moral sentiment of the age has advanced sufficiently to override this barbarous criterion of justice, then will come an end to private property. When man becomes wise enough, powerful enough, God enough, to create, to construct something without bringing into it a single element provided by nature, then, and only then, will I acknowledge his unquestionable right to hold individual property.

Mr. Spencer's ideal of a future Perfect Society is in complete accord with the Communistic theory; but how he can expect that mankind can ever reach so desirable a state under the polluting influences of the system of private property is past my comprehension. To think of realizing such a condition of society while the existing system of property remains would be much like expecting harmony among a dozen bull-

dogs over a bone, or a good result from an international peace congress to which each member should go armed with a revolver and a bottle of whisky. No, such a condition of society can never be reached, except through the equitable, just, and harmonizing influences of a system of common interests—Common Property.

When Mr. Spencer lays down morality as the foundation upon which to build the social structure, so far he does well; he has struck a fundamental truth that cannot be gainsaid.

Now, accepting Mr. Spencer's moral thesis, believing it to be the correct one, will Mr. Spencer tell us by what moral right the few who are sharper, more sagacious, and more able than the rest (not to name the qualities which are usually termed immoral) may appropriate to their own private use and behoof such a share of the fruits of the earth combined with man's labor as to force the multitude of their fellow-beings into the most harrowing, incessant toil and anxiety—a part by their unremitting exertions and scrimping to realize only somewhat of the comforts of life, while another portion, an immense one too, are compelled thereby to drag out wretched lives in poverty and squalor?

Yet the system of unlimited private property in the fruits of the earth combined with man's labor not only admits but provides for just this. Through what manner of straining or curbing of the moral perceptions, therefore, I would ask, could Mr. Spencer have been led to regard the system of private property as "divinely ordained?" To give the faculty of

acquisitiveness its natural freedom, is Mr. Spencer's only answer to this.

Would you give a man the freedom of using his faculties to *oppress* his fellow-men? And if so, how does this accord with that element of morality which is the corner-stone upon which Mr. Spencer has attempted to rear the superstructure of "Social Statics?" No, Mr. Spencer, this will not do. The truth is, you have admitted elements into your social fabric which do not harmonize and cannot be made to harmonize or to rest solidly upon your foundation of morality. You have labored hard to remove these difficulties, and it is probable that no man could have been more successful; yet they stare the reader in the face throughout your work. Had you but swept this system of private property in the fruits of the earth combined with man's labor out of the way, as you did the holding of private property in the earth itself, you would have built up a social system that would have been glorious and no doubt beyond demolition.

The ground-work of Mr. Spencer's philosophy I regard as substantially correct, and it is maintained with a wonderful clearness and strength, but in his practical application he makes some surprising failures. I would speak more definitely here of what has been alluded to in a former chapter, namely, that the many difficulties he encounters arise from attempting to retain and harmonize, in his general plan for putting into practical operation what would best befit a perfect society, the *imperfect institutions* which have been established by a very *imperfect society*, instead of sweeping them all out of the way. And his

greatest fault, as well as that which encompasses him with the greatest difficulty, is that in striking out a course along which to advance toward the ideal perfect society, he leaves altogether too much to *individual effort*. We have seen this where he specifies what constitutes the duties of a state, and it is observable throughout his writings. Yet theoretically, or until he comes to reduce his theories to practice, there can be no exceptions taken to his argument upon individuality. "The highest individuation," he says, "must be joined with the greatest *mutual dependence*. Paradoxical though the assertion looks, the progress is at once toward complete separateness and complete union. But the separateness is of a kind consistent with the most complex combinations for fulfilling social wants, and the union of a kind that does not hinder entire development of each personality." And, again, "Human progress is toward greater *mutual dependence* as well as toward greater individuation."

Now the *mutual dependence* of mankind is fully acknowledged here; yet, whenever or wherever Mr. Spencer attempts putting his theory into practice, he virtually ignores this mutual dependence, leaving all progress to be attained chiefly through individual effort. He does not seem to recognize the importance of clearing away unjust and inhuman institutions that have grown up under ignorance and barbarism; nor does he once suggest the lifting of a hand to assist the unfortunates who are the victims of these inhuman institutions.

In his attempt to apply to existing society the iron-bound system which he has built up with much

elephants mad with pride are the flowers of a grant of land."

So I say that Mr. George's method for making the land ultimately common property, through taxation of the land only, is impracticable. Differing, as I do, then, with Mr. George in regard to the two very essential matters we have been considering, I cannot but feel that he has not struck the core of the difficulty, the "true inwardness" of the subject. Moreover, Mr. George's *plan* of making the land alone common property would be attended with far greater difficulties than would be found in the clean sweep of making all property common. To despoil the land owners of their property by a confiscation of their lands, while leaving all other private property intact, would, were it possible to do it, be a most flagrant hardship and injustice. The *present* land owners have, at all events, come into the possession of their property as legitimately as any other property owners, and the community have no right to despoil them of it. There is a proper, a just, and a feasible way for accomplishing a change in the existing system of property, and this way I shall point out in the course of this chapter.

Numerous propositions have been made, and action in some cases taken, for alleviating the hardships which the system of private property inflicts upon the masses of mankind, some of which, though they do not strike at the root as advocated in this work, it may be worth our while now to notice briefly.

Of those where action to some extent has been taken, the most prominent are trades unions for the securing of better wages to the laborer; and co-

operation, both in the production and distribution of commodities. It is needless for me to enter into any special review of these, as they are in a great measure foreign to my subject, being but plans for relief under the existing property system, and I have only mentioned them for the purpose of lending to them my approval. I believe that both of these institutions have been of benefit to some degree in accomplishing their object.

So long as this system of private property is retained, give us trade unions and co-operative associations; give us anything that will cause the laboring classes to organize and work together for their mutual interests. All such endeavors are educating the people for that higher order of society which is advocated in this work, and will serve to promote its final attainment.

The most prominent, and what, if adopted, would be the most effectual propositions the writer has heard advanced for benefiting the masses under the existing system of property, have been those of a graded income tax, and a limit upon the amount of property which an individual may be allowed to hold. Did I believe the system of private property to be a fixed and unchangeable institution, I should strongly favor one or both of these propositions, as affording the nearest approach practicable to justice and human equality; but, upon the principle that the more obnoxious a thing becomes, the sooner it is likely to find a fitting remedy, I am left in doubt as to the wisdom of these movements. As a matter of abstract justice, however, there is no question that a government, and particularly a government of the people,

like our own, should stand between the unfortunate and those who have filched from them their earnings. To put an entire stop to this filching business is impossible under our existing property system, but to so adjust affairs under our government that a portion of what has been filched from them may be made to inure to the benefit of the working class is quite practicable, providing the members of this class themselves do not sacrifice the privileges which the ballot confers upon them.

Some such course as mentioned above for making the cormorants disgorge some of their ill-gotten prey might possibly hasten the era of collective property, but I am much inclined to the opinion that it would be better to let them continue their depredations unrestrained in order that the present property system may be made as obnoxious as possible, and so come to an end the sooner.

I have little interest in any attempts to bolster up the existing property system. The great desideratum now seems to me to be a fair and thorough trial of practical Communism in our country; such a test of the system as has never yet been had in this or any other country. But before proceeding, as is my intention, to point out a method by which, in my judgment, community life may be made successful in our republic, it is quite essential that we first notice the experiments which have already been made to that end.

In looking carefully over the "History of American Socialism," by John H. Noyes, the writer has been surprised to find how few attempts to test the practicability of genuine Communism, or the system of

collective property as advocated in this work, have ever been made in our country. And he is still more surprised to find that, except in one solitary instance, where established under auspices from which success may have been fairly expected, these attempts have all been eminently successful in a financial point of view; while morally it must be conceded that the members of these several communities have taken their stand above the generality of the people around them. The solitary case of failure, according to the work of Mr. Noyes, of a community organized and established upon a genuine collective property basis, was that of the Yellow Springs Community of Ohio, and it is well to point out here the rock upon which their bark was wrecked.

The exact date when this community was established is not given in Mr. Noyes's book, but it would seem to have been the pioneer community in this country founded under the influence and teachings of Robert Owen. "About the year 1824," says Mr. Noyes, "Robert Owen arrived in Cincinnati, bringing with him a history of his labors at New Lanark, Scotland, giving glowing but not unjust accounts of the beneficent effects of his labors there. At Cincinnati he soon found many congenial spirits, among the first of whom was Daniel Roe, minister of the New Jerusalem church, a society of the followers of Swedenborg. "This society," according to the account given in Mr. Noyes's work, "was composed of a very superior class of people. They were intelligent, liberal, generous, cultivated men and women, many of whom were wealthy."

A domain was purchased at Yellow Springs, and the

community was established under the Communistic, or common property system, pure and simple. As the account goes on to state, "schools were established to teach all things useful except religion. Opinion upon all subjects was free, and the present good of the whole community was the standard of all morals." This lack of religious teachings and want of "divine afflatus," as Mr. Noyes terms it, was, according to his belief, the cause of the community's failure, though we shall see that quite a different cause was given by the unknown writer who furnished the account of the community's history reproduced in Mr. Noyes's work.

We will let that writer tell the story in his own words. He says: "For the first few weeks all entered into the new system with a will. Service was the order of the day. Men who seldom or never before labored with their hands, devoted themselves to agriculture and the mechanic arts with a zeal which was at least commendable, though not always according to knowledge. Ministers of the gospel guided the plow; called the swine to their cover instead of sinners to repentance, and let patience have her perfect work over an unruly yoke of oxen. Merchants exchanged the yardstick for the rake or pitchfork. All appeared to labor cheerfully for the common weal. Among the women there was even more apparent self-sacrifice. Ladies who had seldom seen the inside of their own kitchens went into that of the common eating-house (formerly a hotel), and made themselves useful among the pots and kettles; and refined young ladies, who had all their lives been waited upon, took their turns in waiting upon

others at the table. And several times a week all parties who chose mingled in the social dance in the dining hall. But, notwithstanding the apparent heartiness and cordiality of their auspicious opening, it was in the social atmosphere of the community that the first cloud arose. Self-love was a spirit which would not be exorcised. It whispered to the lowly maidens whose former position in society had cultivated the spirit of meekness: 'You are as good as the formerly rich and fortunate; insist upon your equality.' It reminded the favorites of former society of their lost superiority; and, in spite of all rules, tinctured their words and actions with the love of self. Similar thoughts and feeling soon arose among the men; and, though not soon so exhibited, they were none the less deep and strong. It is unnecessary to descend to details; suffice it to say that at the end of three months the leading minds in the community were compelled to acknowledge to each other that the social life of the community could not be bounded by a single circle. They therefore acquiesced, but reluctantly, in its division into many little circles."

We need not follow this account further. When they got to this point, it was only a question of time, of course, when the community would be dissolved, and this time came within a single year. It will be seen that it was an inordinate hankering for *social position*, not a lack of religious teachings or any "divine afflatus," that caused the breaking up of this community. If religious teaching in the common acceptation of the term, or the "divine afflatus," as Mr. Noyes styles it, is sufficient to quell or even curb

this social hankering after position, then why does it not accomplish this in our churches?

There is an innate desire in every human breast to meet upon terms of social equality wherever man comes in contact with his fellows; and this, too, even while he may be cognizant of inferiority to many in mind, or character, or both. And I claim that he is justly entitled to such a position, for what is man in character or development but the creature of circumstances? No more sublime truth was ever given to man than that uttered by Robert Owen, when he said that man's character was formed *for* him, not *by* him. Inheritance and surroundings make the human being what he or she is. If some are inferior to us, let us not forget that under like circumstances we would have been as they are, and we should regard it as an imperative duty required of us to do what we may toward raising them to our level. This we can do only by putting off all exclusiveness, doing away with all caste-like barriers, and mingling with all upon terms of absolute social equality.

The "lowly maidens" in the community at Yellow Springs were entitled to be treated as the equals of the former aristocratic maidens and dames of wealth and culture, and if the latter could not accept this then their departure should have been requested and insisted on. This being the only pure and simple Communistic association that has ever met with signal ill-success, when placed in a position where success might be expected, to know of the cause of its failure is exceedingly important, that provision may be made against the recurrence of the mistake in the future.

One of the ill-successes among communities founded upon the strict common property system was the Haverstraw Community. This community failed, however, not from any difficulties inherent in the system under which it was founded, but by bad management, as thousands of adventures are failing under the private property system. It purchased property to the amount of $18,000, upon which was paid only $6,000, a mortgage being given for the balance. It then admitted members whose principal occupation was, as stated in its history, "parade and talk." Such members and such a debt were enough to break any community.

The Coxsackie Community was a case similar, and came to grief through the same cause, though it is not stated whether this community was established under the strict common property system or not. Another community called the Kendal, of which it is not stated whether organized or not under pure and simple common property principles, failed through sickness and death; seven of the heads of families having died within a short time, among whom were some of the most valuable and useful members; and, after all this ill-fortune, the surviving members were forced to abandon the enterprise through the rapacity of the person from whom they had purchased their lands.

We find, therefore, that four in all of the communities established in America under a system of common property pure and simple—admitting the Coxsackie and Kendal to have been such—have failed. As an offset to these, we have *ten* Shaker communities, I think, now in a flourishing condition, some of

which have existed over a century; the Rappites, now at Economy, Pa., in continual existence since the beginning of the century; the Society of Ebenezer, in Iowa, founded in 1846; the Zoarites, in Ohio, founded in 1816, and the Jansenists, in Illinois, established in 1846. The Oneida Community was established under strict common property principles, but has been changed of late into a joint-stock association. That this community was successful, at least in a financial point of view, so long as it was run under the strict common property system, is well known. Established, as it was, however, under a system of complex marriage, and with the belief of the directing mind or minds that it could not be successfully maintained as a common property association, except through this marriage relation, when the outside world came to interfere in a threatening manner with this domestic arrangement, the system of complex marriage was abandoned, and with it the system of common property.

Regarding this, all I have to say here is that I do not share the belief of the directing minds in this community upon the complex marriage matter; but, on the contrary, have full faith that a community may be successfully maintained upon a common property basis under the existing laws of the state in regard to marriage.

Another, and for a time very prominent, community which failed was Robert Owen's great experiment in this country—the New Harmony Community. But, contrary, no doubt, to prevailing ideas upon the matter, I would here say that this community was not organized or ever run even for a day under a strict

system of common property. Except a small portion which he made over to another party, who retained his portion also as private property, Mr. Owen held the title to the land (about 30,000 acres) in his own name throughout the whole history of the experiment.

Paul Brown, who wrote a book called "Twelve Months at New Harmony," says, "There was no such thing as real, general *common stock* brought into being in this place," and attributes all the troubles of the community to the anxiety about *exclusive property*. In looking over the history of this community, there is no difficulty in discovering the causes of its failure; in fact, it would have been a miracle had it proved successful. Mr. Owen returned to Scotland directly upon the organization of the community, leaving its superintendence in the hands of one Taylor, to whom he gave some sort of interest, and who turned out to be a consummate rogue, swindling and deceiving Mr. Owen in a variety of ways; erecting a tan-yard on the premises in opposition to him, also a distillery, with such effect upon the members of the community as may be readily imagined. But as this was not a community operating upon a system of common property, it has really no place among the failures of communities organized under this basis.

And so we see that Communism, founded on a pure and simple system of collective property, has not been such a failure in our country as it is generally supposed.

Horace Greeley, who favored Fourier's system of joint-stock association, and took an active part in the experiments to demonstrate the practicability of Fourier's scheme in this country, but who did not

has been proposed for the reorganization of society somewhat on the Socialistic plan, and to which I am obliged to dissent:

A very excellent work, called "Progress and Poverty," written by Henry George, has lately been published and received with much favor. This has rejoiced the soul of the present writer, as he discovers in it the entering-wedge of a great truth. Written with a masterly hand, this work demolishes much that has been taught by the most distinguished among the earlier political economists. The question of common property in land, before advocated by Herbert Spencer and others, Mr. George takes up, and shows its advantages and justice in a manner so convincing as to leave no room for doubt.

Mr. George's work fails, however, by stating but a half truth; by stopping before he touches bottom. Holding, as Mr. George does, that the earth naturally and justly belongs to the whole collective race of humanity, how can he logically hold that the *fruits of the earth* may justly become the exclusive property of any single individual?

Mr. George looks forward, apparently, to what he calls "the dream of the Socialist," where the want, misery, and wretchedness of poverty shall no longer prevail, with the same enthusiasm that is displayed by the Socialist or Communist himself. But still I cannot conceive how Mr. George can for a moment indulge such a hope while the system of private property in all except the land is retained. It is not the land we eat, nor can we make clothes of the land. It is the *fruits of the land*, when brought forth by man's labor, that provide for all our material

wants. If these are left to the cormorants and vultures of earth to gobble up at their pleasure, and in unlimited quantities, how, I would ask, are want and poverty to be driven from the world?

Mr. George seems to be of the opinion that were the land to be made common property, men with great fortunes would no longer exist. Does he not know that there are many men, worth their millions to-day, who own little or no land whatever? Now, what is going to prevent such individual wealth, should the land only become common property? In fact, if men were denied the privilege of piling up their riches in land, is it not probable that they would the more voraciously gather and appropriate to themselves the fruits of the earth combined with man's labor?

No, Mr. George has not touched bottom in his work. Let him ponder over the subject and try again on a sound basis, and I have no doubt he will give us a book which time can never make obsolete.

I must notice another proposition advanced by Mr. George, *i.e.*, his method of making the land common property by abolishing all taxes save those on land. Mr. George argues that this would secure the desired object without reducing the wages of labor or the reward of capital—without increasing the cost of production or the price of commodities.

Now, if I view the subject correctly, he has made a mistake here. Let me illustrate: Suppose I were the owner of the land upon which stands the store of R. H. Macy & Co., and that the assessors, in making up their tax valuations, should fix such a value upon the land as would make the tax upon it

just $5,000. Under Mr. George's plan, suppose the tax on this land were increased to $10,000, $20,000, $50,000, or $100,000—what is to hinder me from demanding from Messrs. Macy & Co., for the rent of my property, a sum sufficient to cover the increased taxation, and to secure to me an income above the taxation equal to that which I had previously received upon the property; and would it not, in fact, be expected that I should do this? Where, now, would this increased taxation on the land ultimately fall—upon me, or upon the patrons of Macy & Co., who must needs increase their prices to cover the increased rent? Would Mr. George argue that Macy & Co., rather than pay the increased rent, might remove to some less eligible site; to the suburbs of the city, or to Brooklyn, Jersey City, or Hoboken, where land rent would cost less? Yes, but they might also do that now and save an immense amount for rent, but their customers would hardly be likely to follow them, nor can I see why this would be any more likely to occur under Mr. George's plan. It is the convenience, the eligibility of the site, its environment, that warrants Macy & Co. in paying high rent now, and it would be the same under Mr. George's plan; but in the one case, as in the other, it is the patrons who virtually pay the rent in the increased price of their purchases. Nor would the shifting of situations while remaining in eligible localities change the matter, for such taxation as Mr. George proposes must be impartial. Would Mr. George claim that, in the case of Macy & Co., brought forward for illustration, the buildings not being taxed, the total amount of taxation upon the property would

not be greater than at present; hence no increased price upon their wares need be required to cover rent? This possibly might be so, though not probably; for somewhere the taxes for the support of government would have to be raised, and Mr. George himself admits that they would naturally fall heavily upon the more eligible sites in the cities and larger villages.

This is not really what I am arguing, however, as what I desire to show is that, while the land is retained as private property, any increase of taxation upon it will ultimately fall upon the community at large, and not upon the land owner.

Turn, now, from distribution to production, and we shall find the same result quite as obvious, and particularly so where products come directly from the soil. If all taxes were placed upon the land, and this increase were not confined to the land in the cities and large villages, then there must be an increased tax on farm lands, which necessitates the farmer putting an increased price upon the products of the soil to cover this increased tax; and so we see again that it is the community at large, not the land owner, who must ultimately pay this increased taxation. In a word, there is really no shifting of taxation from the community at large upon the land owners. So long as the land is held as private property, and protected as such by our laws, so long is the land owner master of the situation.

The quotation from the Brahmans, given by Mr. George himself, aptly illustrates the matter, which is this: "To whomsoever the soil at any time belongs, to him belong the fruits of it. White parasols and

tion would sometimes occur. It would be necessary, therefore, that some plan should be fixed upon at the commencement to provide a remedy for such mistakes.

I will now sketch the outlines of a plan for organizing and putting into successful operation such a community as I have endeavored to foreshadow.

I have already suggested that our embryo community should be planted upon a philanthropic basis, and furnished with ample means for carrying out its designs. Several reasons why this should be so will become manifest as we proceed, but the most important of these is: that the trustees under whose rule the organization takes place should be in a position to act independently in the admission or rejection of those applying for membership. It is manifest, upon a moment's thought, that such independence could not be felt, or would not be likely to be carried out strictly, unless the property of the community was so held by it that no one outside its authorized trustees would have any right to interfere. The property of the pioneer community, then, should be a full and free gift to it, for the use and behoof of its members in perpetuity, or while it should maintain its existence intact, and a clause should be inserted in its constitution providing that if the community should ever be dissolved, its entire property should be made over to such charitable institutions as might be named.

"Why this," would you ask? I answer, in order to provide as far as possible for its perpetuity; in other words, to prevent its being changed into a joint-stock association after the manner of the Oneida

Community, the result of which most probably would be its manipulation and ultimate ownership by a few sharpers.

The sum required for putting such a community in successful operation should first be estimated, and not stingily either, and not a move should be made involving money matters until every dollar of the required fund had been paid in. Subscriptions should be made to it under the proviso that unless the whole amount required was subscribed none should be called for, and that in case all was subscribed, and there was a default when collections were attempted whereby the total sum could not be raised, whatever had been collected should be returned to those from whom it came. When the estimated sum required had been raised, the community could then start upon a sound financial basis, auguring success almost beyond a doubt, and operations might then be commenced toward the necessary outfit. A tract of land should be purchased not far from some large city likely to furnish a market for much of their produce and wares. The land should be good, too. No scrub-oak, yellow-pine, sand-expanse, or barren rocky domain, should be purchased—after the style of the Fourierites in this country—but rich, arable soil that would produce almost anything asked of it. The quantity of land purchased should be proportioned to the proposed number of individuals the community should contain. This number might be anywhere from one hundred and fifty to three hundred. The number of acres of land required I will not undertake to say here, as this would depend much upon circumstances. The land purchased and

paid for, the next step would be to erect the necessary buildings thereon. The writer has already expressed his views as to what these should be. Then comes the assembling of the inmates. As the community must set out for a success financially, as well as in other respects, its members must be able-bodied, in good health, and competent for manual labor. Neither should too many children be admitted to start with. Some there might be, for it would be a lonely dwelling without them, but not so many as to cripple the financial resources.

In the selection of members to compose the community, none should be accepted whom the managers had not met and conversed with personally, and who could not produce the highest recommendations from several of the most trustworthy citizens in the places where they had hitherto resided. Before admittance to membership, all should be required to sign the constitution, which should contain a clause providing for the expulsion of any member by a majority vote of all the members; and that in case of such expulsion, the expelled member agreed to forfeit all claim, right, or title to any portion of the property of the community. This may be regarded as drawing the reins a little tight, but none too tight, as there must be some way provided for ridding the community of those who make themselves obnoxious or fail wilfully to fulfil the duties required under the community's rules. Such members as the community wanted would not be deterred from joining on account of such a restriction; it is probable, in fact, that such would become the more anxious to join upon discovering such a safeguard for their protection. Had the

Yellow Springs Community had this restriction, and another throwing their property all into the hands of charitable institutions in case of dissolution, it is quite probable that those "aristocratic maidens" would have managed to endure the "maidens of low degree," and that it would have been to the advantage of all concerned.

The community being ready to commence operations, the trustees should resign their charge, and the officers of the community be chosen, consisting of a magistrate, four councilmen, and a secretary and treasurer. This election should be quite free for each individual member to vote for such officers as he or she might desire, though if the former trustees were members of the community, as it is to be supposed would be the case, and had performed their duties as trustees satisfactorily, civility would dictate that they be chosen as the first officers of the community, providing they, or either of them, should appear qualified for the somewhat difficult duties which they would now be called upon to perform. The qualification of the officers would need to be somewhat varied. For instance, one should be competent to superintend the schools or educational branch, another the manufacturing, a third the agricultural, and a fourth the mercantile; while the magistrate should have a general oversight, and be a general adviser and director over all.

The hours of labor would seem to be the next question, and here the writer would say that, in this pioneer experiment (if experiment that may be called which is virtually sure of success if carried out according to the plan laid down here), he would recom-

mend an increase in the hours of labor beyond those given in a former chapter of this work, which were set for a period when the collective property system is supposed to have been long in vogue, and the advantages derived from it had become universally realized.

Financial success should be made sure, else the community would certainly come to grief; hence the hours for labor should not be so much shortened as to be prejudicial to its prosperity. In fact, it should be the object of the community to so increase its wealth that it might lend a hand to the new communities likely to spring out of it through a natural increase of its own household, as well as from others that may be drawn toward it through a desire to reap similar advantages. Yet the hours for labor might be reduced considerably compared with those of the present day, both in agricultural and mechanical pursuits. Eight hours in summer and seven in winter I would deem sufficient to begin with, the time afterward to be diminished in accordance with the dictates of experience. As I have so often said in these writings, none of a proper age and in health should be exempt from their due share of manual labor, except it be the teachers in the schools and possibly the community's officers.

Now having no desire to dodge any question which must necessarily present itself for adjustment in community life, I will state here what appears to my mind to be the most formidable difficulties likely to arise in such an association, and the methods I would suggest for disposing of them. As already spoken of, *expulsion for just cause*—that is, for continual bad

conduct, or that which is deemed sufficient by a majority of the members—I consider indispensable; as this, and this alone, would be efficient for securing harmony and good-fellowship in the community. Of course the member should be first admonished by the magistrate when complaints of bad conduct were made; but when admonition has failed, then it is time for the unruly member to vacate before contaminating others to any essential degree.

Then the matter of dress, which has been mentioned in another portion of this work, is one which might cause a flutter in the minds of some very worthy people. I would therefore add a few words. I would say that although I regard uniformity in the style of dress as best, it does not follow that short frocks, and broad-brimmed hats *a la* Shakers, must needs be adopted, or anything else of a similar unbecoming character diverging so widely from the ordinary style of dress adopted in the world around.

On the contrary, I should say let dress conform to any particular style chosen from among those in use by the people generally, taking care that it shall be the one most becoming to the different figures of which all clusters of people are usually composed. Different colors for garments might be worn, but there should be a close correspondence in *quality* of all fabrics used for this purpose. I regard it as absolutely essential that the dress of some should not be more expensive either in material or workmanship than that of others.

Other questions which would naturally arise would be the fixing upon some satisfactory plan for the visiting of friends scattered about the country—for

favor the common property system, speaks of the latter, in his "Recollections of a Busy Life," as follows: "That there have been, nay, are, decided successes in practical Socialism, is undeniable; but they all have that Communistic basis which seems to me irrational and calculated to prove fatal. . . . . I can readily account for the failure of Communism at New Harmony, and in several other experiments; I cannot so easily account for its success. Yet the fact stares us in the face that while hundreds of banks and factories, and thousands of mercantile concerns, managed by shrewd, strong men, have gone into bankruptcy and perished, Shaker communities, established more than sixty years ago upon a basis of little property and less worldly wisdom, are living and prosperous to-day. And their experience has been imitated by the German communities at Economy, Zoar, the Society of Ebenezer, etc., etc. Theory, however plausible, must respect the facts."

The examination we have now made proves conclusively that Communism, under a strict common property basis, has proven a decided financial success in our country. It has also produced citizens that for intelligence, culture, and moral qualities are fully up to the standard of local society; and yet it has by no means reached that high ideal—hardly mounted above the first round of the ladder toward it—which the writer would point to as the summit of its possibilities. Had the communities named here given more attention to the improvement of the mind, to knowledge, culture; had they improved their schools, and fitted them up with all the necessary requisites for scientific investigation and research; gathered

together extensive libraries — in short, had they turned their attention more to the wants of the mind, and less to the wants of the body, they not only would have greatly enhanced the vision, the measure, and the happiness of their own lives, but would have given and bequeathed to their children far more that is better than gold.

A word here about Fourier's scheme, in order that it may not be confounded with Communism. Nothing is more common, when the system of collective property is broached, than the bringing up of these Fourier failures as proof conclusive that Communism is wholly impracticable, when the truth is that Fourier's system did not embrace the system of common property at all. It was a scheme for a joint-stock association in which individual property was fully recognized.

But it is with a feeling of sadness that one dwells upon the career of the leaders in these enterprises — the little bands of noble souls who struggled and toiled, and in some cases staked their all, upon these Fourierite efforts to improve the condition of their fellow-beings. Yet we may not truthfully say that they labored and struggled in vain. With all their struggles and discouragements, under the many difficulties which they encountered, their experience of community life was such as to imbue their hearts with the warmest attachment for it. Among those who tasted of it, the longing for a return to this mode of life seems to have been almost or quite universal. More than this, their faith that community life in some form is the true one, and the one that will be ultimately adopted upon the earth, seems

never to have forsaken them. They did not often speak of the matter publicly, for men are naturally reticent upon the subject of their failures; but when they did speak, they stood up like heroes against the shafts of ridicule and the calumnies of prejudice, and defended it with an energy and warmth that showed their attachment and their faith.

Mr. Frothingham, in his life of George Ripley, the leader at Brook Farm, speaks of an attempt in 1877 to bring the old brotherhood together for a few hours of social enjoyment, and though they did not finally meet, owing to various causes, several replied by letters, portions of which letters Mr. Frothingham quotes in his work, and some of which I will reproduce here. Mr. Ripley wrote: "Brook Farm may well point to the children who graced her social circles so long time ago, and who have since ripened into strong men and noble women, saying, with the modest pride of the Roman matron, 'These are my jewels.'"

Mr. Dana acknowledged it "a great pleasure to look back upon the days when we were together, and to believe that the ends for which we then labored are sure at last, in good time, to be realized for mankind." In a eulogistic article upon Mr. Ripley, at the time of his decease, Mr. Dana also writes: "It is not too much to say that every person who was at Brook Farm for any length of time has ever since looked back upon it with a feeling of satisfaction. The healthy mixture of manual and intellectual labor, the kindly and unaffected social relations, the absence of everything like assumption or servility, the amusements, the discussions, the friendships, the ideal and

poetical atmosphere which gave a charm to life—all these combine to create a picture toward which the mind turns back with pleasure, as to something distant and beautiful, not elsewhere met with amid the routine of this world."

Among the letters referred to was one from Mr. Channing, who wrote: "The faith and longing for the perfect organization of society have only deepened with time." Another wrote: "Were I not occupied exactly as I am, I should indulge myself, at the cost of a good deal of effort even, in the pleasure of a meeting with fellow-laborers whose faith in the truth of our social principles has never faltered, I am sure, any more than my own." Another wished that his "children could live under such influences, that, on the whole, were so pure and refined," etc.

These quotations speak volumes in the interest of community life; and so I say that though failure to a certain extent attended the efforts of those who led in the glorious work which they set out to accomplish at Brook Farm, yet neither their unsuccessful efforts nor those attending the other phalansteries can be regarded as total failures. They have at least placed buoys on the rocks that wrecked their own frail barks as a warning to those coming after them.

Having now noticed as far, perhaps, as may be profitable here, the experiments made in practical Communism in America, we approach the task of attempting to lay before the reader a plan for a further experiment in community life, which the writer has high hopes may eventually be made; and which he is sanguine would be attended with such results as to make it no longer doubtful that the collective

property system is the wisest and best that can be devised. The writer would say at the outset, however, that he is in no wise unmindful of the difficulties which are sure to attend the organization and establishment of the system of collective property throughout our land. But, as Mr. Mill remarks, "the great difficulty at the beginning is that in the points of moral education, on which the success of Communism depends, the present state of society is demoralizing, and only a Communistic association can effectually train mankind for Communism."

I must be permitted to quote a little further from Mr. Mill in this place, as the opinions of such distinguished men bear so much greater weight with us all than do the same opinions advanced by an anonymous writer.

He goes on to say, at the close of the sentence above, that "it is for Communism, then, to prove, by practical experiments, its power of giving this testimony. Experiments alone can show whether there is as yet, in any portion of the population, a sufficiently high level of moral cultivation to make Communism succeed, and to give to the next generation among themselves the education necessary to keep up that high level permanently. If Communistic associations show that they can be durable and prosperous, they will multiply and will probably be adopted by successive portions of the population of the more advanced countries, as they become morally fitted for that mode of life."

The writer coincides with every word that Mr. Mills says here. The difficulties attending the planting of an embryo community are great, though

by no means insuperable. The position of a pioneer community, such as that contemplated by the writer, would be analogous to that of an army pitching its camp in an enemy's country. To maintain its position, in either case, there must be steadfast devotion to the cause, staunch, unswerving loyalty; there must be faith, also, in the ability of the commanding general and his staff, and there must be discipline of the first order. With these requisites, the position of the community could be held against all outside influences or assaults.

In the next attempt at practical Communism, I would have it shown that community life is pre-eminent above all other methods for cultivating, refining, and bringing out the higher qualities of the human soul. I would present to the world a model institution that shall excite their admiration and command their respect. Given such an institution as this for our embryo community, and there need be no fears as to its continuance, or that its example would not influence others in the world around to go and do likewise.

What, then, is required in order that we may organize and put in successful operation such a pioneer community? First, ample means; second, that it should be composed of picked individual members. I agree here fully with Mr. Mill, that for the first venture a community should be composed of selected individuals with such requisites as shall place its success beyond a doubt. The care, too, in selecting the members for such a community would necessarily be great. And with all the care that could possibly be taken, no doubt mistakes in selec-

CHAPTER XVI.

DANGER.

ALTHOUGH in the preceding chapter the writer has made a somewhat vigorous protest against the righting of wrongs by Force, yet he is not unaware of the fact that thus far in the course of human events great *oppression* has usually culminated in violent revolution. Another fact to which I would call the reader's attention here is that—leaving aside religious dissensions—it is the property question that causes the greater portion of all intestine conflicts. It is said it was slavery that caused our late rebellion; but what is slavery save property in man? And so, if seemingly otherwise, we shall find by probing to the root that, as a rule, it is the property question that is the cause of most domestic conflicts—as it has already been pointed out that it is of international wars. Trace the history of nations if you would become better convinced of this fact. The incessant conflicts between the rich and poor in Greece so demoralized her people and sapped her resources that she fell an easy prey to victorious Rome. These domestic feuds were the hardest matters which her rulers found to contend against, and her philosophers and statesmen were continually striving to devise some plan by which these conflicts might be avoided.

The immortal Plato saw, no doubt, what was ever likely to be the fate of a people striving to exist under a system of individual property, hence the "Republic."

Rome furnishes another illustration of this same character. Almost constantly were these internal conflicts being waged under the Roman republic, and according to Gibbon the Roman empire fell from them at last. Here is what he says on the subject: "The most potent and forcible cause of the destruction of Rome was the domestic hostilities of the Romans themselves. At the beginning of the tenth century began a dark period of five hundred years, in which Rome was perpetually afflicted by sanguinary quarrels of the nobles and the people, the Guelphs and the Ghibelines, the Colonna and the Ursini."

So fell Rome! and her fate, I contend, must ultimately be the fate of every people that persists in maintaining the system of private property. Coming nearer our own times, we find both Europe and America—the whole world, in fact—convulsed every now and then with domestic conflicts born of this very same cause. These conflicts will continue, and grow more and more bitter and sanguinary, so long as the existing property system is retained.

"Why this," would you ask? Because there is that in human nature which revolts against *oppression*, and the system of private property gives rein to the most despotic oppression. We are often told that there is *no excuse* for these domestic conflicts relative to property matters in *our* country, and this I shall believe when I can be convinced that there is no

oppression growing out of our existing property system, and not before.

I do not forget what I have said in a former chapter, and hold firmly to my statement that there is always a better way for righting wrongs than through violence; but I do not admit that the oppressed of this or any other country have *no excuse* for rising up against their oppressors.

It matters little, however, what may be the individual opinions of men as to the best methods of righting wrongs; the tide of progress must and will continue to roll on, be it through peaceful or violent means, until the oppression of man by his fellow shall no longer be known upon the earth. The concessions must come, too, on the part of the oppressors, if the better course is to be taken for the righting of those wrongs which spring from our property system.

It is true that we have not such flagrant oppression as had been borne for some considerable time in France directly preceding her revolution of 1789, but it should be understood that Americans have been so educated that no such putting on of the screws as was there long endured would be suffered here for a moment before there would be open revolt. And now, while I would not attempt to define—as did Cazotte in reference to the French Revolution, with a prescience which now seems almost miraculous—who are to be the prominent victims, and by what means they shall fall, my belief is that, unless some radical measures are taken through which property shall cease from passing into the hands of a few with the rapidity of the last quarter of a century, before such another period shall roll around our country will be

convulsed with internal struggles and violent conflicts. My countrymen, we are sleeping upon a volcano, and these half-stifled murmurings continually reverberating are the prelude of what is to come, except we take measures efficient for its prevention.

Shall we go on, then, as we are going, and bequeath to our children the conditions which shall involve them in unutterable woes, or shall we take measures to prevent these foreseen troubles? If the latter, it is high time for us to act, and it behooves us to act quickly. Something, at least, must be done to provide the opportunity to labor for those who have no other means of support; and, moreover, some better way than we now have must be provided for securing to the laborer the just reward of his toil. But these, after all, are but mere makeshifts for prolonging the life of a property system that ought to die and be forgotten.

Association in Equality is the only method by which mankind can dwell peacefully and harmoniously together on the earth.

Reader, my task is finished. I have done my best to impress you with the fact that intelligent Communism, or a well-devised system of collective property, is *not* that infamous property system which it is usually taught us would plunge mankind into confusion, anarchy, and bloodshed, sap their energies, subvert all progress, and destroy civilization itself. I have done my best to show up the individual property system in its true light; to give a fresh insight into the innumerable and abominable wrongs which are its legitimate progeny.

Yet I am quite sensible of having fallen short of my

desires—my unspeakable longings. For years I have pondered almost constantly over the future of man as disclosed in my vision. I have dwelt upon this theme as I have roamed over the fields, as I have trod alone the silent forest, or as I have cast my fly along some mountain stream; and when I have climbed some lofty mountain-peak which gave outlook upon a vast expanse of arable domain, I have beheld through the imagination those beautiful community-homes dotting the landscape and peopled with an intelligent, refined, and superior class of beings, whose life on earth was a blessing and a joy. I have often been lost in abstraction, too, as I have walked the crowded streets of my own city, musing intently and delightedly upon that future of man which is to be, and imagining myself surrounded by its glories, until some spectacle of human misery has suddenly met my eyes to dispel the illusion and remind me of the disagreeable fact that I was still chained to our existing inhuman condition of society by bonds which I could not dissever. It is in this ideal future that I truly live; that which is in actual existence about me seeming, in these ecstatic moments, as of the dead past.

I know well that many, yes, probably far the greater portion of mankind at the present day, will regard such a work as I have written with indifference, contempt, or abhorrence, perhaps all these. I shall be charged, no doubt, with the "sowing of dragons' teeth," as others have been before me, but this matters little. No, write me, if it so please you, as a society-disturber, an ignoramus, or a madman, but write me withal "as one who loves his fellow-men."

the adjusting of time and means for this purpose; as also the entertainment of relatives and friends of the members of the community. Affairs of this sort should all be treated in a liberal manner, otherwise the members of the community would be likely to feel that they had met with a loss of liberty in not being in a condition to gratify their most natural and cherished desires.

There is no question that these difficulties may be overcome to an extent that would grant to the members of the community, as a whole, greater liberty and more privileges of this nature than are now enjoyed. As I have said, however, be liberal here; put no straitjacket upon individual liberty and privileges; no restraint likely to chafe where reason is used and a due regard to justice and liberty only are called for. My own opinion is that one month out of every twelve should be granted each member for visiting friends or traveling wherever they might desire; and that some reasonable sum of money, which, however, I will not attempt to name, should be allowed each for the paying of their expenses. This time might be taken all at once, or at separate periods, as the members might choose, except during seed-time or harvest.

As to the course adopted for entertaining in the community home the relatives and friends of the community members, it is clear that some rule would need to be adopted whereby payment for such entertainment should be made to the community after a certain period of stay—and from the first, perhaps, by those who would have no proper claim for hospitality—except that the community proposed

resolving itself into a charitable institution. No other difficulties of importance likely to occur in the working operations of the community, save those here spoken of, now present themselves to my mind; and I do not think there are other difficulties as great as these. Most of these difficulties, too, would be avoided were community life under the system of collective property general throughout the land; but it must not be forgotten that I am here planning for a community to be planted amidst the antagonistic surroundings of private property.

I have now sketched the outline for our embryo community, so far as presented to my mind; spoken of the difficulties likely to ensue, and suggested methods through which I think they may be overcome. What think you, reader—are the difficulties to be met with under community life, when presented and pondered over, as great as you had imagined?

Community life under the system of collective or common property has so long been taught as impracticable that we well know a deep-seated prejudice has been formed against it, yet it does seem to me that, when any good, common sense brain takes up the subject, investigates it thoroughly, weighs its difficulties, and examines the means through which they may be avoided or overcome, the question will rise up clearer and clearer before the mind the more it is studied, until the student will ultimately become convinced that Communism is not only practicable, but that, in truth, it is not exceedingly difficult.

And if such a life as the writer has made the attempt to foreshadow in this work could once be

made a reality upon the earth, how charming, how glorious it would become to all!

We have "a case for trial," says Mr. Mill, and it is certainly a case the most important and momentous ever yet before the tribunal of man. Let our embryo community be organized under the plan marked out herein, or one similar and as much better as the suggestions of others may make it, and I cannot discover how it can help being successful in every way. If successful, as the charms of such a social life become seen, it would become appreciated and extended, until these community homes would dot the earth below as the stars spangle the firmament above.

And now, my fellow-men, to you I would appeal with all the fervor of one whose heart is in what he advocates; who strives to make the lives of those to come after him better worth living; who would drive ignorance, superstition, ostentation, vanity, crime, poverty, and wretchedness, from off our fair earth—to you, I say, he would appeal to put this great and glorious work in operation.

How many thousands of you might individually, if you felt so disposed, furnish the entire means for establishing such a community without depriving yourselves or your children of a single want. And there are millions in our country who might contribute generously to such an enterprise without feeling the loss of a single dollar put into the good work. What nobler or more promising legacy, in fact, could one bequeath to his children than to establish them in such a community? No safer investment, or one that would hold out the promise of equal security toward supplying their physical,

mental, and social wants and desires in abundance, it seems to me, could possibly be made.

Has the period arrived in the evolution of society toward a higher and nobler standard, when the love of their kind has so imbued the souls of even a small Spartan band that they will furnish the means requisite to test the result of such a community as the writer has depicted? If so, then our embryo community will soon be established. If otherwise, then it must wait until such a period shall arrive.